

Report on an unannounced full follow-up
inspection of

HMP Hewell

5–9 November 2012

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

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
1 Safety	19
<hr/>	
2 Respect	31
<hr/>	
3 Purposeful activity	45
<hr/>	
4 Resettlement	51
<hr/>	
5 Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	59
<hr/>	
6 Appendices	
<hr/>	
I Inspection team	67
II Progress on recommendations from the last report	68
III Prison population profile	80
IVa Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews (closed site)	83
IVb Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews (open site)	101
V Photographs	118

Introduction

HMP Hewell has faced significant challenges in recent years. It was formed in 2008 following the amalgamation of three former prisons on the site, each holding a different category of prisoner and with a different function. At the time, this made it one of the largest prisons in the prison estate. In 2011, the category C site was closed leaving the prison with a closed, local category B site and an open category D site. There has been a rapid turnover of governing governors during that period. In 2012, the prison was rocked by the escape of a category A prisoner who was being escorted from the prison – the first such escape from any prison in many years.

It was perhaps not surprising, therefore, that at the time of this inspection the prison had no clear sense of direction, some staff appeared to lack motivation, and in some areas poor practice had been left to develop unchallenged. A common response to some of my questions was 'it's nothing to do with me', and concerns I had were explained with a shrug as 'Hewellisms' – 'the way things are done around here'. As a consequence, the inspection identified a number of significant concerns and the new governor faces a major challenge in reversing the slide in the prison's performance.

The prison was unacceptably dirty – appallingly so in some places. Some communal areas were filthy, and even after they had been 'cleaned' by underemployed and badly supervised wing cleaners, they remained so. All sorts of waste was thrown out of prisoners' cells into the exercise yards below – this went unchallenged even when happening in full view of staff, and the resulting mess was left untouched. Most prisoners wanted to keep themselves and their cells clean but were thwarted by a lack of cleaning materials. On one wing I visited, cleaning materials in a store room under staff control were missing – staff I spoke to accepted this was so but were unable to explain the discrepancy. Too many prisoners on the closed side were sharing cells in poor condition that were designed for one. Dormitories on the open side were cramped, dilapidated and lacked even the most basic privacy.

A lack of active, professional engagement by some officers with prisoners was apparent in other areas. There were high levels of assaults and in part this reflected poor supervision and an unwillingness of some staff to challenge poor behaviour. We saw cells for new arrivals that were dirty and covered in graffiti. Night staff did not systematically check on new arrivals. Prisoners were generally positive about relations with staff, which were usually polite but distant – but we witnessed some poor interactions. Black and minority ethnic and foreign national prisoners were significantly less positive about relationships with staff than the population as a whole.

Some important processes were applied inconsistently or without the necessary authorisation. For instance, prisoners were routinely subject to a squat search when they first arrived. This very intrusive procedure should only be used exceptionally when there is intelligence to justify it. The governor was unaware it was happening and stopped it when we brought it to her attention. Association and visits often started late. Prisoners lacked confidence in the complaints system. On top of all this, 35% of prisoners on the closed side and 42% on the open side told us it was easy to get drugs in the prison, and 17% and 36% said it was easy to get alcohol – all much higher than we see in comparable prisons. Use of force, disciplinary processes and the segregation unit were generally well managed, although the regime for the minority of prisoners who spent a long time in segregation was very limited.

A lack of staff engagement, some poor relationships, inconsistent treatment, little faith in the complaints system and the ready availability of drugs and alcohol is a toxic mix that needs sorting out quickly.

A running theme of the inspection was the poor quality of the information managers had to identify areas of concern and address performance. Data about prisoner-on-prisoner violence and self-harm were particularly poor and we were not confident that safety issues were identified and addressed. There had been little attempt to identify the reasons for an increase in the number of self-harm monitoring documents (ACCTs) opened. Follow-up of recommendations arising from deaths in custody was limited. Drug testing was inconsistent. Intelligence was not used or shared effectively.

The quality and outcomes of learning, skills and work activities were good. Ofsted inspectors praised the management of this area and described imaginative and effective provision, such as an excellent project training dogs for the hearing impaired. However, on the closed site, far too few prisoners were able to benefit from this. We found more than half the prisoners locked in the cells during the working part of the day – much more than we usually see. Despite the best efforts of learning and skills staff, attendance and punctuality were poor and residential staff failed to challenge non-attendance appropriately. Allocation to activities was ad hoc and inconsistent. Provision for vulnerable prisoners and remand prisoners who wanted to work was particularly poor. Prisoners on the open side were fully occupied.

Retired and disabled prisoners who were unable to work spent most of the day locked up. There was little specific provision for them, and some prisoners with disabilities were unable to access important parts of the prison. Staff were unaware of those prisoners who might need assistance if an emergency evacuation was required.

The most positive aspects of the prison concerned the preparation of prisoners for release. There was a comprehensive resettlement strategy that underpinned work to reduce the likelihood that prisoners would reoffend and provide practical resettlement help. The prison and a range of voluntary sector providers offered a range of services that were generally effective in ensuring prisoners had somewhere to live, work and training opportunities, money advice, and help to tackle health and substance misuse issues after release. Facilities for visits and work to support family life were very good. There was some excellent and innovative restorative justice work and support for veterans. The open site provided prisoners with some good opportunities to prepare for release and reintegrate into the community.

There are significant concerns about HMP Hewell whose performance has deteriorated sharply since our last inspection. Much of the prison provided an unsafe and degrading environment for staff and prisoners alike. The prison now needs support and stability to halt and reverse this slide in performance. Some staff at HMP Hewell are doing excellent work; the performance of a minority is unacceptable, and too many of the others are disengaged or sitting on the fence. Managers at a local and national level need to be very clear that the current level of performance is not acceptable, and ensure that effective and robust action is taken to achieve improvement.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

February 2013

Fact page

Task of the establishment

A category B local and category D open prison

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

Public

Region/Department

West Midlands

Number held

1,137

Certified normal accommodation

1,003

Operational capacity

1,271

Date of last full inspection

November 2009

Brief history

HMP Hewell was established in June 2008 following the amalgamation of three former prisons on the site – Blakenhurst, Brockhill and Hewell Grange. Each site catered for a different category of prisoner – categories B, C and D. In 2011, house block 7, the category C section (formerly Brockhill), was closed. Remaining were house blocks 1-6 on the closed site (formerly Blakenhurst) and house block 8 (formerly Hewell Grange), also known as the Grange Resettlement Unit or the open site. The prison primarily serves the Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, West Midlands and Warwickshire catchment area.

Short description of residential units**Closed site**

House block 1 – 202 mainstream convicted prisoners

House block 2 – 138 convicted prisoners including vulnerable prisoners and those held separately for their own protection

House block 3 – 207 mainstream convicted prisoners

House block 4 – 211 prisoners in substance misuse and the integrated drug treatment system

House block 5 – 79 convicted vulnerable prisoners

House block 6 – 247 remand prisoners and those carrying out induction

Open site

Grange Resettlement Unit – 187 category D prisoners, including two annexes accommodating nine and 11 prisoners respectively who were nearing the end of their sentences.

Other units

Segregation – 28 prisoners

Health care centre – 20 prisoners

Name of governor/director

Stephanie Roberts-Bibby

Escort contractor

GeoAmey

Health service commissioner and providers

Commissioner: Worcestershire Primary Care Trust

Provider: Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust

Learning and skills providers

Milton Keynes College

South and City College, Birmingham

Dudley College

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Tony Roper

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.¹

Safety

HP7 Reception processes were reasonable but searching procedures were degrading. Most first night support was good but new prisoners were not monitored after they had been locked up. Induction was mixed. Most prisoners felt safe but more than we would expect to see did not; some also felt victimised by staff. Work on violence reduction and suicide and self-harm was inadequate. The number of prisoner-on-prisoner assaults was high and data and trend analysis around safety, including suicide and self-harm prevention was poor. The anti-bullying policy was not used

¹ **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*.)

effectively and not all poor behaviour was being robustly challenged. Security arrangements were improving but there were still significant weaknesses. The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy was not being adhered to and some arbitrary decisions were being made. The positive mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate was high, but there were early signs of improvement. More prisoners than at comparator prisons said that it was easy to get illegal drugs. Segregation offered a very basic regime. Use of force was proportionate. Data and trend analysis about disciplinary matters was poor. Substance misuse services had improved and were now good. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

- HP8 At the last inspection in 2009 we found that Hewell was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test. We made 35 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that 12 of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved, 18 had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.
- HP9 It was inappropriate that category D prisoners arriving on transfer to the open site had to spend time on house blocks (HBs) 1-6. Prisoners were very negative about the lack of respect shown during searches on arrival and strip- and squat-searches in reception were carried out almost routinely. Holding rooms were poorly decorated. Reception processes were mainly efficient.
- HP10 Most first night procedures were good with Insiders (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to support others at risk of self-harm) providing some excellent support. Some first night accommodation we viewed was poor and ill-prepared for occupation. There was no staff contact with newly arrived prisoners after they had been located in cells until the following morning. Induction was reasonable on the closed site, but inadequate at the open site.
- HP11 Prisoners' perceptions of safety in our survey were generally in line with the comparator, but disabled, Muslim and black and minority ethnic prisoners were significantly more likely to report feeling unsafe at some point. Most prisoners at the open site told us that they generally felt safe, although in our survey significantly fewer than the comparator reported this. Data indicated that prisoner-on-prisoner assaults were high. Some key managers often failed to attend safer custody meetings. Monitoring data was not being used effectively to inform the local strategy and some incidents were not being reported. Staff were not following the anti-bullying procedures outlined in the local policy and several prisoners had been subject to the anti-bullying process for far in excess of the stipulated period.
- HP12 Dialogue between relevant departments to ensure recommendations from deaths in custody investigations were being addressed was limited. The number of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents and incidents of self-harm were increasing, but the reasons for this had not been established. The quality of entries in ACCT documents was inconsistent, and case reviews lacked multidisciplinary attendance. There was evidence that in some cases, care for vulnerable prisoners was inadequate. Prisoners had good access to Insiders, who felt well supported.
- HP13 Work on some security issues had improved but significant weaknesses remained. The use of intelligence was improving as was the number of security information reports received; however, the way in which other relevant security data was

collected was not always effective and the analysis of information was often poor. Some dynamic security elements were weak. The security committee was reasonably well structured but attendance at meetings, particularly from managers in some important areas, was inconsistent. Formal links with key areas such as safer custody and the drug strategy group were underdeveloped. The random positive MDT rate for six months to October 2012 was high but overall the trend was downward. In our survey significantly more prisoners than in comparator prisons on both sites said it was easy to get drugs.

- HP14 The IEP policy had been reviewed but many of its protocols had not been implemented and applications for promotion were often not dealt with well. We were not assured that prisoners were always demoted on the basis of the published criteria and there were examples where decisions to downgrade them were not justified.
- HP15 The number of formal adjudications was high but records showed that proceedings were usually conducted fairly. Monitoring arrangements were poor in a range of areas related to discipline and important links to safer custody were weak. There had been a slight increase in the use of force since the previous inspection, but the number remained similar to comparator prisons. The quality of use of force paperwork was reasonable and demonstrated that force was used only as a last resort.
- HP16 Some segregation cells were grubby with graffiti on walls. Special cells were grim, but used infrequently. The number of prisoners requiring segregation was high but the average length of stay was reasonably short. The regime was poor for longer stay prisoners.
- HP17 The integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) offered flexible recovery-focused prescribing. Arrangements on arrival for prisoners needing support were good. Most prisoners in treatment were satisfied with the support received, but those at the open site were less satisfied. Prisoners and staff at the open site remained confused about drug testing practices.

Respect

- HP18 Many areas were filthy and poorly maintained and as a consequence provided a deplorable living space. Some accommodation was unsuitable. Cleaning materials were often unavailable. Staff-prisoner relationships were generally polite but often somewhat distant. Staff did not sufficiently challenge poor behaviour. Diversity needed better coordination and there were some gaps in provision. Services for foreign national prisoners were good, as was faith provision. Prisoners lacked confidence in the applications and complaints processes. Health services were reasonably good. Prisoners did not like the food. There could be unacceptable delays in receiving the first canteen order. Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.
- HP19 At the last inspection in 2009 we found that the closed part of the prison was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test, but the open prison was not performing sufficiently well. We made 87 recommendations in the area of respect.² At this follow-up inspection we found that 48 of the recommendations had

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

been achieved, 15 had been partially achieved, 23 had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.

- HP20 Yards and general areas were dirty and many cells were in poor condition with inadequate furniture and insufficient screening for toilets. Communal toilets on some landings and yards were particularly filthy. Some cells designed for one were used for two prisoners. Access to cleaning materials was poor. Accommodation at the open site was mostly unsuitable with cluttered, partitioned dormitories, most of which were in a poor state of repair.
- HP21 The two annexes on the open site provided much better accommodation. Access to applications was inadequate and prisoners had little faith in the process. Rules were generally well communicated to prisoners at both sites. Regular consultation took place.
- HP22 In our survey most prisoners said that staff treated them with respect but those from some minority groups were less positive. Prisoners at the open site were significantly more positive than at our last inspection. Interactions between specialist staff and prisoners were good. Interactions between prisoners and wing staff were distant and there was little active engagement beyond dealing with requests. In our survey prisoners reported that staff did not check on them regularly. We saw some poor interactions and there was evidence that staff were not challenging poor behaviour.
- HP23 The equality and diversity policy was comprehensive and the action plan kept up to date. The quarterly equalities committee meeting was usually well attended but coordination of work in this area needed to be improved. Monitoring data on black and minority ethnic prisoners was good and anomalies were investigated. Data collected about other protected characteristics was inadequate. Paid prisoner equality representatives provided prisoners with valuable advice and support. Discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) were freely available across both sites. Investigations were of a mixed standard and we were not assured that all had been completed within acceptable timescales or that prisoners had received any feedback. Quality assurance procedures for DIRFs were inadequate.
- HP24 Black and minority ethnic, Muslim and disabled prisoners were more negative in our survey about a range of issues. The personal emergency evacuation plan (PEEP) system for disabled prisoners was poorly maintained. There was little adapted accommodation available and prisoners with mobility problems could not easily access some areas of the prison such as health care. Specific provision for older prisoners was insufficient. Foreign national prisoners were reasonably positive in our survey and we found that support for them was good; support for this group from prisoner representatives and Insiders was particularly good but they were less positive about staff treating them with respect. There was an over reliance on prisoner interpreters, even for confidential matters. There was some good support for prisoners from a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller background and for gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners. The chaplaincy was well integrated into the daily life of the prison and active in a broad range of areas. Faith provision and chaplaincy facilities were good.
- HP25 Prisoners generally lacked confidence in the complaints system, and complaints forms were not available on all wings. Monitoring of complaints was good. The quality of responses to complaints was reasonable, but some low level matters had not been

fully investigated, and in too many cases, responses took too long. Legal rights provision, including bail information, was good.

- HP26 There was a good staff skills mix in the health care unit, but there were staff vacancies. Prisoners in our survey were generally dissatisfied with the quality of health care services as well as access to them. Nevertheless, the range and quality of most services that we observed was good, although patients were waiting too long on the closed site to see a GP. All prisoners were adequately screened in reception and on induction. Pharmacy services were satisfactory but there were some issues related to the security and dispensing of medicines. Dental services were good. Despite our survey results, patients were very complimentary about the staff and quality of care received at the prison's in-patient facilities, which had improved. A large team of mental health nurses provided a satisfactory integrated primary and secondary care service but services were stretched.
- HP27 Many prisoners did not like the food. Catering for the wide range of cultural needs was reasonable. Facilities allowing prisoners to dine out of their cells at the open site were inadequate. Prisoners could wait up to 16 days to receive their first canteen order. Many were concerned, with justification, that this could easily result in debt and bullying.

Purposeful activity

HP28 Too many prisoners were locked up during the working day and there was significant slippage in the regime. Time out of cell at the open site was good. For those involved in activities, the management of learning and skills and quality of education and vocational training was good. There was a good range of opportunities at the open site; however, on the closed site, where unemployment was high, opportunities were very limited and were particularly poor for vulnerable prisoners. Qualifications achievement for a small number was high. Attendance and punctuality at education in the closed site was poor and the activity allocation process was being undermined. Library services were good. Access to the gym was good for many but we were concerned it was underused by vulnerable prisoners. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

HP29 At the last inspection in 2009 we found that the closed site was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test, and the open site was performing well. We made 25 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that 14 of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved, seven had not been achieved and three were no longer relevant.

HP30 Prisoners at the open site had very good access to time out of cell and outside areas. Time out of cell on the closed site for those in full-time activities was reasonable but over 50% of prisoners were locked up during the working day and outcomes for these prisoners were much poorer. We observed regime slippage, which reduced access to association and activities.

HP31 Management of learning and skills was good. Actions had a clear focus on good provision, maintaining excellent partnership working and supporting innovative developments. Education and production workshops were well managed. There were

insufficient activity places on the closed site, many jobs were wing based and prisoners were poorly supervised. Unemployment was very high. There was inadequate purposeful activity for vulnerable prisoners. The induction and allocation process for education, vocational training and work activities was undermined by more informal ad hoc arrangements.

- HP32 Teaching had improved and was good. Target setting for learning was appropriate. Teachers were skilled in managing and recording the learning that took place. The quality of individual coaching and group training in vocational and industrial workshops was good and prisoners were engaged well. Peer mentors were used well. Construction and catering were impressive. Too little other vocational training was on offer at the closed site. A good range of vocational training was available at the open site.
- HP33 Education staff helped prisoners improve their English and mathematics skills without prisoners having to leave their work areas. Staff were able to provide support to those with specific learning needs. The work with the dairy herd at the open site was notable. The dogs for the hearing impaired was an excellent initiative.
- HP34 The achievement of qualifications and standard of work were very good in both education and vocational subjects. Prisoners developed good employability, vocational and personal skills. Regime inefficiencies significantly reduced the number attending education and punctuality on the closed site. New skills and knowledge gained through work in the farms and gardens were insufficiently recognised and recorded.
- HP35 Library services were appropriate and well managed. A good range of books, newspapers and magazines were stocked. Celebration of diversity was particularly good and the writer-in-residence was excellent. The relocation of the library on the open site to an accessible ground floor location was good. Prisoners had access to useful resources for job search and resettlement work.
- HP36 Access to physical education (PE) recreational activities for mainstream prisoners at both sites was good. Vulnerable prisoners had too little provision and even this was underused. There was restricted access to accredited provision. We were not confident that best use was being made of the facilities. The PE provision had not been reviewed to explore alternative ways of working, including how to better manage the facilities at the open site.

Resettlement

- HP37 Some good strategic work had been carried out to shape provision according to prisoners' needs. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was used at the open site for a good variety of activities although the number going out to work and college was relatively low. Offender management appropriately targeted higher risk cases and for these prisoners contact with offender supervisors was regular, although it was much more limited for other groups. Assessments and target setting were reasonable but there was a backlog in the completion of assessments. There was no custody planning for short-term prisoners but their needs were assessed. Public protection arrangements were appropriate and categorisation and home detention curfew (HDC) work was good. Work with indeterminate sentence prisoners at the open site was good. There were some gaps in programme provision but there was a good range of

support in the resettlement pathways. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

HP38 At the last inspection in 2009 we found that Hewell was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test. We made 23 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that 14 of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved, five had not been achieved and two were no longer relevant.

HP39 The resettlement strategy lacked an explicit reference to any needs analysis but needs information had been used effectively to plan services and governance was good. ROTL was used for a good range of resettlement purposes on the open site but the number going out to work and education was small. It was rarely used on the closed site.

HP40 In our survey most sentenced prisoners told us that they had a sentence plan, although on the open site, this was fewer than we would expect. High risk prisoners had regular contact with offender supervisors; others had no ongoing contact beyond preparation of a risk assessment and an initial needs assessment. There was no custody planning for short-term prisoners or those on remand. The quality of risk assessments and sentence planning targets were mostly good but too many assessments and reviews were prepared late. HDC arrangements were robust and applied fairly.

HP41 Public protection arrangements were effective: prisoners of concern were identified, the risk they presented was assessed and the information shared. Prisoners were informed of restrictions placed on them and how they could be challenged. Categorisation reviews were up to date and prisoners were provided with full information about the reasons for decisions. Prisoners serving indeterminate sentences and located on the open site made steady planned progress towards supervised release.

HP42 All prisoners had an initial needs assessment and referrals were made to appropriate services. They were interviewed prior to release in good time to take remedial action. The accommodation advice provided was effective and comprehensive. Employment, training and education (ETE) provision was now working more cohesively. There was a good focus on work with prisoners who needed motivation to engage in activities that would benefit them on release. All prisoners on the open site completed a preparation for work course before starting community service, but this needed to be better focused. A good range of financial support and debt advice was available and prisoners had the opportunity to open a bank account prior to release. Health and substance misuse support on release was reasonably well developed.

HP43 The visitors' centre was an excellent facility. Family support workers were friendly and helpful and there was an extensive range of useful information on display. The social visits provision was very good. Visits on the closed site often started late. The visits room was large and well decorated, but furniture and fixtures were in a poor condition. Facilities at the open site were good. A wide range of courses to encourage and support family life were on offer at both sites and all prisoners could access family visits.

HP44 The restorative justice project linked to victims' representatives was an excellent initiative. A restorative programme for vulnerable prisoners in some stage of denial of

their offending was to be piloted. A good resettlement service for veterans was available. A limited range of accredited offending behaviour programmes was offered. There were some gaps in the provision.

Main concerns and recommendations

HP45 Concern: The number of prisoner-on-prisoner assaults was high. Staff were not adhering to the local anti-bullying policy and we observed insufficient supervision of prisoners. We saw examples of poor behaviour going unchallenged. The dilatory delivery of some processes, such as delays in obtaining canteen on arrival, were unacceptable and a contributory factor in levels of bullying.

Recommendation: Staff should actively engage with and supervise prisoners so that anti-social behaviour is challenged, violence reduction policies are consistently implemented and risks to prisoner safety are identified and reduced.

HP46 Concern: Many prisoners told us that drugs and alcohol were easy to obtain in the prison and weaknesses in the testing and intelligence systems meant we were not assured the issue was being effectively addressed.

Recommendation: A drug and alcohol supply reduction strategy should be developed/reviewed which should include the application of a consistent testing regime, effective use of intelligence and co-ordination between the relevant departments.

HP47 Concern: Data collection and analysis of incidents, including prisoner-on-prisoner violence and self-harm were poor and failed to assure us that the prison was addressing prisoner safety effectively. Prisoner-on-prisoner violence was higher than we would have expected and not all incidents had been recorded. Work to address the recommendations of death in custody reports was limited and the number of open ACCTs and incidents of self-harm had increased. The safer custody meeting was not adequately analysing the data to identify trends in prisoner safety and formulate appropriate responses and strategies to deal with the prevalent issues.

Recommendation: Monitoring data about safety issues, including violence reduction, findings from investigations about self-harm incidents and deaths in custody should be effectively collated and used to inform the local strategy to improve safety overall.

HP48 Concern: Many areas were grubby and some filthy, particularly exercise yards and some shower and toilet areas. Cleaning materials were not routinely being provided, and cleaners were poorly supervised. There was no published cleaning schedule for the closed site. Some areas needed refurbishment and many cells lacked appropriate furniture. Dormitories at the open site were cramped and lacked privacy.

Recommendation: Standards of cleanliness in all areas should be significantly improved and maintained, and facilities refurbished to an acceptable standard.

HP49 Concern: There were insufficient activity places for the population at the closed site, which resulted in over half of prisoners being locked up during the working day. Three hundred and seventy prisoners were unemployed and many wing jobs were of poor

quality or badly supervised. The use of activities that were available was being undermined by poor attendance and punctuality.

Recommendation: Sufficient activity places should be provided at the closed site so that all sentenced prisoners can be fully engaged.

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 Journey times to the prison were generally short and escort vans were clean and well equipped. Prisoners continued to wait too long to return to the prison following court appearances.
- 1.2 Most prisoners travelled relatively short distances from local courts or prisons. Prisoners travelling longer distances told us that they had been offered refreshments and comfort stops. Transport was clean and well equipped and prisoners said that escort staff treated them well. Prisoners did not receive any information about the prison prior to their arrival and previous best practice, which saw prisoner Insiders (prisoner peer workers) employed at local courts, had ceased.
- 1.3 Some late arrivals had been waiting for transport for considerable lengths of time following court appearances. This led to several vans arriving in the evening with a large number of prisoners. Despite this, the prison made every effort to expedite disembarkation and we did not witness any lengthy waits on vans at the prison.
- 1.4 Prisoners transferring out of the prison were not informed until the morning of transfer. Video link facilities to facilitate some court appearances were used on a daily basis.

Recommendations

- 1.5 **Prisoners should be held in court cells for the minimum period possible.** (Repeated recommendation 1.13)
- 1.6 **Subject to risk assessment and status, prisoners should receive 24 hours' notice of planned transfers.** (Repeated recommendation 1.16).

Housekeeping point

- 1.7 The prison should explore the possibility of reinstating prisoner Insiders at local courts.

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 Reception on the closed site required redecoration. Searching arrangements were inappropriate. Reception opening times were inadequate at the open site and category D prisoners arriving on transfer were initially inappropriately located on the closed site. Safety screening and initial first night arrangements were sound and backed by some excellent peer support work; however, there were gaps in the process. Induction provided prisoners at the closed site with relevant information, but was more limited at the open site.
- 1.9 The reception area at the closed site required redecoration. Holding rooms were sparse, had little or no information and contained offensive graffiti. The open site reception was only open two mornings a week, and category D prisoners arriving on transfer were commonly inappropriately located on the closed site for between one and five days, depending on the day of arrival.
- 1.10 All prisoners, including those moving within the prison to the open site, were strip-searched; prisoners were very negative about the way in which these searches were carried out. All were also unacceptably subject to squat-searching, although this practice ended during the inspection when we brought it to the attention of the governor who was unaware it was happening. Processes were conducted reasonably quickly and interactions were respectful if business-like. Initial safety screening was not conducted privately. The immediate needs of prisoners were well catered for. Showers were not offered in reception but were available on wings depending on the prisoner's time of arrival.
- 1.11 Time spent in reception was mainly acceptable, but, as a result of some late court arrivals and the requirements of some prisoners to see a doctor, could occasionally be in excess of four hours. No meals were provided for those arriving after 6.30pm. Prisoners' property was mostly managed well, but remand prisoners' access to property was overly restrictive – they could only have court clothing sent into the prison.
- 1.12 Initial first night processes were good; prisoners had a private one to one interview with a first night officer soon after their arrival. This was supported by a private interview with Insiders (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to support others at risk of self-harm) who offered some excellent support. Translated information was limited. Most arrivals were housed on house block (HB) 6; others went to either HB 4 (the integrated drug treatment unit) or to HB 5 (for vulnerable prisoners). Cells had not been prepared for occupation and those seen on HB 6 and HB 4 were dirty, graffiti-ridden and lacked basic equipment. Night staff on HB 6 were unaware of the location of newly arrived prisoners or the need to see prisoners before the roll check the next morning. First-time prisoners received further support from Insiders, through a follow-up interview and an excellent 'first time in prison' meeting in the chapel. The specific needs of newly arrived prisoners at the open site were not considered.
- 1.13 All prisoners on the closed site received an induction that commenced on the first working day after their arrival and took place over three days. The content was appropriate and newly arrived prisoners we spoke to had a good understanding of the prison regime and how to access services. Induction for those at the open prison was less well developed and consisted of an explanatory session with an Insider and a question and answer session with staff. A new, more formal process had been drawn up but had yet to be implemented.

Recommendations

- 1.14 The closed site reception area should be refurbished and well maintained. (Repeated recommendation 1.42)
- 1.15 Category D prisoners should be transferred directly to the open site and the practice of accommodating them on the closed site and routine strip-searching should cease.
- 1.16 Initial safety screening interviews should be conducted in private.
- 1.17 Squat searches should only take place exceptionally when authorised by a manager on the basis of a risk assessment.
- 1.18 First night cells should be clean and properly prepared for occupation.
- 1.19 Night staff should speak to and know the location of all new prisoners and be aware of any specific needs they might have at both sites.

Housekeeping points

- 1.20 Prisoners arriving in the evening should have access to a hot meal.
- 1.21 Key information for prisoners should be displayed in holding rooms.
- 1.22 Remand prisoners should be able to receive clothing through the post or during visits for an initial period following first reception.

Good practice

- 1.23 *The excellent use of prisoner Insiders during first night processes and the 'first time in prison' meeting provided new prisoners with a reassuring and informative welcome.*

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.

- 1.24 Prisoners' perceptions of safety were similar to those in comparator prisons, but some on the open site and minority groups were less positive. Incidents of violence on the closed site were high. Safer custody meetings were poorly attended and monitoring data was not being used effectively enough. Oversight of the use of antisocial behaviour monitoring was poor.
- 1.25 There was a comprehensive safer custody policy, but this had not been based on a needs analysis. The safer custody team met monthly but attendance had declined and key

stakeholders, including health care and security staff, did not always attend. Monitoring data was not being used effectively enough to inform the local strategy.

- 1.26 Most prisoners in our survey reported feeling safe but some from minority groups were much less likely to say this. There had been 94 reported prisoner-on-prisoner assaults at the closed site in the six months prior to the inspection, which was significantly higher than at other similar prisons. Safer custody staff maintained a log of violence-related incidents, but under-reporting was apparent. For example, the recording and investigation of unexplained injuries had only begun in September 2012. There were gaps in the log which meant data about unexplained injuries was unreliable and of those identified, 20 had not been investigated.
- 1.27 Staff did not adhere to the antisocial behaviour procedures outlined in the local policy, and several prisoners had been subject to the process for far in excess of the stipulated period. In addition, levels of staff supervision of prisoners were not always sufficient (see section on staff-prisoner relationships). The approach adopted did not reassure us that problematic behaviour was being dealt with robustly. Three prisoners had victim support plans, but entries in these and in the local antisocial behaviour policy documents were mostly observational (see main recommendation HP45). The prison had a hotline for families and friends through which they could report prisoner-related concerns; calls were logged and investigated. Feedback had been given promptly in every case. Those considered high-risk following a cell sharing risk assessment (CSRA) were reviewed monthly, but for others this was much more ad hoc.
- 1.28 In our survey significantly more prisoners in the closed site than in comparator prisons reported feeling victimised by staff, and this was again more marked in minority groups. Vulnerable prisoners, mainly those charged with sex offences, were held on HB 5; one spur on HB 2 held a mixture of those who needed to be separated because of their offence or for other reasons, such as being in debt to other prisoners. Vulnerable prisoners were escorted separately around the prison and had separate workplaces. We saw no obvious weaknesses in procedures that placed them at risk.

Recommendation

- 1.29 All cell sharing risk assessments should be reviewed regularly.

Housekeeping points

- 1.30 Managers should investigate the negative views of victimisation by staff at the closed site and take any appropriate action to address problems.
- 1.31 Attendance at the monthly safer custody meetings should be improved and monitored.

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.

- 1.32 Not all recommendations related to deaths in custody were being addressed. The number of ACCTs opened and self-harm incidents was increasing but the reasons for this had not been established. The quality of self-harm monitoring documents was mixed and there was evidence that some prisoners subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) procedures were receiving inadequate care. Initial assessor reports were generally good, but there was little evidence of multidisciplinary attendance at case reviews. There was good access to Insiders, who felt well supported.
- 1.33 Since our last inspection there had been seven deaths in custody, three self-inflicted. There was limited dialogue between relevant departments to ensure recommendations from deaths in custody investigations were being addressed. Prisoner and Samaritans representatives attended the monthly safer custody meetings but attendance by staff from other departments had declined (see section on bullying and violence reduction). The number of ACCTs opened and incidents of self-harm were increasing but it had not been established why. Monitoring data was not used to inform the safer custody strategy so that incidents of self-harm could be reduced. Comprehensive investigations were carried out after serious incidents of self-harm, but these had not been consistently discussed at safer custody meetings so that lessons could be learned. We were made aware of cases where the care of those on open ACCTs had been inadequate.
- 1.34 Most staff had been trained in ACCT procedures. We were concerned that night staff were not required to check on prisoners following handover from day staff (see section on early days in custody). Care and support plans were generally good but did not always specify which members of staff were responsible for the prisoners' care. Entries in ACCTs were mixed and many purely observational. There was a weekly management check of 10% of ACCTs but findings were not followed up. Senior managers were receiving training to address these issues. Post-closure reviews were often late and most lacked multidisciplinary attendance.
- 1.35 Prisoners on constant watch to prevent self-harm were usually located in gated observation cells in the health care unit. Two similar cells in the segregation unit had been used eight times in the past six months, three solely to prevent self-harm, providing prisoners who were already vulnerable with a poor environment. Access to Insiders was generally good and the four care suites for prisoners in crisis provided was appropriate. Telephone handsets enabling prisoners to contact the Samaritans were not available and they had to use wing telephones. Systems were in place to notify outside agencies when those subject to self-harm monitoring were being released.

Recommendations

- 1.36 **The gated cells in segregation should not be used solely to prevent self-harming.**
(Repeated recommendation 3.47)
- 1.37 **The prison should provide telephones so that prisoners can contact the Samaritans in private.**
- 1.38 **ACCT reviews including those post-closure should take place on time and there should be appropriate multidisciplinary attendance.**

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.39 There was a local adult safeguarding policy but this was not embedded across the prison. The governor had initiated contact with local authority safeguarding officials to develop local processes.
- 1.40 The health care department had introduced an adult safeguarding policy in October 2012, but it had not been embedded across the prison. The policy aimed to assist staff in recognising the abuse of adults at risk and offered guidance on roles and responsibilities. The head of health care was a member of two primary care trust safeguarding committees, which had good links with the local authority. The governor had met with the independent chair of the local authority adult safeguarding board, with the intention of initiating training to develop adult safeguarding champions.
- 1.41 Health care staff were required to complete safeguarding training and were aware of how to make referrals. At the time of our inspection no prisoners were subject to safeguarding, but staff told us that advocates had been used for prisoners with certain medical conditions. The health care team was able to offer advice on learning difficulties.

Housekeeping point

- 1.42 The local adult safeguarding policy should be rolled out across the prison.

Security

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.43 Some fundamental security issues were being addressed but more needed to be done to improve the effectiveness of security processes overall. The use of intelligence was improving and the department was receiving more security information reports (SIRs), but some relevant security data was not always collected efficiently. Attendance at security committee meetings, particularly by some key personnel was inconsistent. Formal links to some areas were poor. The random positive mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate was high, but the trend over the past four months was mainly downward.

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

- 1.44 Some important elements of dynamic security were weak. The security committee was properly structured but attendance at meetings was inconsistent, particularly by managers from key areas within the establishment. The analysis and collection of relevant security information was underdeveloped. Reports from the open site were rarely included and staff representing the site did not usually attend security committee meetings.
- 1.45 In January 2012 there had been a high profile escape from a prison van shortly after it had left the prison and a number of security issues relating to this were being addressed.
- 1.46 Links between the security department, violence reduction and drug strategy committees were weak and sharing of information was poor. Key stakeholders failed to attend drug strategy meetings consistently. The focus on some fundamental security issues had improved. A weekly information bulletin had been introduced and scheduled security training for all staff grades had been introduced.
- 1.47 Target searching of staff and prisoners based on intelligence was improving and the rate of drug and mobile phones finds had increased. Police intelligence officers had been appointed to collate intelligence and were providing good information to help inform strategies. Systems to identify and track key security issues and prisoners of concern had been introduced.
- 1.48 There were signs that these initiatives were having an overall impact in improving security. We saw no evidence that the prison was risk averse when allocating activity spaces to prisoners and the modified system to allow movement along secure corridors was proportionate. However, some basic areas remained weak, including searching arrangements (see section on early days in custody) and staff supervision of prisoners (see section on staff-prisoner relationships).
- 1.49 The number of SIRs received by the department had increased, but intelligence was not always communicated to other areas of the prison, particularly the violence reduction and drug strategy teams; this meant that the teams could not make informed decisions about prisoners or take action. The SIRs sampled had been submitted by staff from a wide range of departments but the information was predominately observational and demonstrated a reliance on the security department to deal with most issues.
- 1.50 Many prisoners at both sites said it was easy or very easy to obtain drugs and there was general confusion among staff and prisoners about the consequences of positive tests. The positive random MDT from May to October 2012 was high at 11.68%. However, the range between 21.3% and 4.6% indicated a downward trend. Weekend testing targets were regularly missed and there was slippage of all MDT at the open site. The suspicion target testing rate from May to October 2012 was 41.8% and there continued to be a lack of monitoring of slippage between requested and actual tests (see main recommendation HP46).
- 1.51 The testing suite in reception on the closed site was clean but lacked privacy; it was also inappropriately used as a GP consulting room. The open site suite was dirty and both mandatory and compact based drug testing had been conducted there. Where prisoners tested positive following MDT, they were rarely referred to the substance misuse team in a timely manner.

Recommendation

- 1.52 Links between the security department and the violence reduction and drug strategy committees should be strengthened, attendance at meetings improved and data analysed more effectively.

Incentives and earned privileges⁴

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.

- 1.53 The IEP policy had been reviewed but some protocols had not been implemented. Prisoners' applications for enhanced status were often not processed properly. We were not assured that prisoners were always demoted on the basis of the published criteria and there were examples where decisions to downgrade prisoners to the basic level were not justified.
- 1.54 New arrivals were placed on the standard level of the IEP scheme unless they had earned enhanced status at a previous establishment; 25% of prisoners were on the enhanced level and about 2% on the basic level.
- 1.55 The comprehensive IEP policy had been reviewed and published early in 2012. However, many of the procedures it described had not been implemented properly at the closed site, where the scheme was poorly managed. There was little evidence that it was used strategically to encourage or support good behaviour. Reviews of levels often did not take place on time and there was evidence that they sometimes did not happen at all. Written records were poor and there was little evidence that the scheme was connected to sentence management processes.
- 1.56 There was evidence that applications for promotion submitted two months prior to the inspection had not been dealt with. There were also examples where decisions to demote prisoners to the basic level following an investigation of a single incident were not justified or in keeping with the published policy. The IEP scheme was managed reasonably well on the open site.

Recommendations

- 1.57 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme should be linked to the sentence planning process, and should be used to challenge prisoners to achieve agreed targets. (Repeated recommendation 7.43).
- 1.58 Decisions to demote prisoners to the basic level should be fair, based on patterns of behaviour and always justified; outcomes should be monitored to ensure this happens.

⁴ In the 2010 report, 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.

Housekeeping point

- 1.59 Applications to be promoted to the enhanced level should be processed quickly and reviews should be timely.

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.

- 1.60 The number of formal adjudications was high but records revealed that proceedings were usually conducted fairly. Standardisation meetings were held but there was little evidence that relevant information was being analysed. Use of force incidences had increased slightly since 2009, but remained similar to comparator prisons. There had been an increase in the number of incidents that did not involve control and restraint techniques. The quality of use of force paperwork was reasonable, but data analysis of the nature, type and location of incidents was poor. Living conditions in segregation were mainly reasonable but some cells were poor. The number of prisoners requiring segregation was high but average stays were reasonably short. Monitoring of segregation through management meetings was poor and links to safer custody were weak. The regime for longer stay prisoners was poor.

Disciplinary procedures

- 1.61 The number of formal adjudications was high at an average of 171 each month, an increase of about 21 per month compared with the last inspection. Charges that led to formal hearings were appropriate and only a small number were for petty prison rule infringements. Most records of hearings sampled showed that proceedings were conducted fairly and that punishment was appropriate and consistent. However, some records did not indicate that prisoners were given the opportunity to explain fully their version of events. A few appeared rushed with little to show that the prisoner had properly engaged with the process.
- 1.62 There were quarterly adjudication standardisation meetings but attendance was inconsistent and minutes did not always reflect sufficient discussion about relevant issues. Monthly statistics about the number and nature of adjudications were not presented for analysis and links to other parts of the prison, particularly the safer custody committee, were not in place (see also section on bullying and violence reduction). The outcomes of proven offences were not being noted, categorised or communicated to managers to identify trends to help deal with particular problem areas as they arose. The adjudication room in the segregation unit was appropriately laid out but the waiting room was bare and failed to provide prisoners, who could wait there for over two hours, with anything to do.

Housekeeping point

- 1.63 Attendance at standardisation meetings should be improved.

The use of force

- 1.64 Use of force was not excessive. There had been 146 incidents in the 10-month period prior to the inspection. Of these about 40% did not involve full control and restraint techniques, 30% were planned interventions and 70% were spontaneous. This was slightly higher than in 2009, but remained comparable with other large local prisons. Nearly all incidents occurred at the closed site. Monitoring arrangements were reasonable and quality checks of use of force forms were carried out following all incidents. Sharing of information was poor and links with the violence reduction committee and senior management team were weak. Information about the nature of incidents was poorly collated and there was insufficient analysis.
- 1.65 Spontaneous and planned interventions were well organised, properly carried out and documentation was generally completed correctly. Proper authority was recorded, senior staff supervised all incidents and video was recorded. Documentation indicated that force was only used when it was necessary under the circumstances and proportionate to the incident. Many examples showed that de-escalation techniques were used to good effect.

Segregation

- 1.66 Prisoner accommodation in the segregation unit consisted of 18 ordinary cells, two special cells and two gated observation cells. Overall living conditions were reasonable and communal areas clean; however, some cells were grubby and graffiti-ridden. The special cells were grim but very rarely used.
- 1.67 The number of prisoners requiring segregation was high at an average of about 67 per month. Most of these (about 60%) were segregated for good order or discipline. However, prisoners remained in segregation for a comparatively short time at less than seven days, with a few notable exceptions. Most prisoners returned to normal accommodation on the closed site.
- 1.68 Day to day management of segregation was good. A basic daily regime programme included daily showers, exercise and access to telephones. The regime for longer-stay prisoners was poor; they remained locked in their cells nearly all day with nothing meaningful to do.
- 1.69 Monthly segregation management and monitoring meetings were poorly attended and there was little discussion of segregation issues. Information about the number of segregated prisoners and their length of stay was not sufficiently analysed and links with relevant areas, such as violence reduction and suicide prevention were poor.

Recommendation

- 1.70 Detailed analyses of adjudications, use of force and segregation should take place and links to the safer custody committee strengthened.

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.

- 1.71 The integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) offered flexible recovery-focused prescribing. Most prisoners in treatment were satisfied with the support received, but those at the open site were less satisfied. Prisoners and staff at the open site remained confused about drug test practices.
- 1.72 Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust provided the IDTS service. There were appropriate management and supervision arrangements. Health care staff screened new arrivals, and when necessary prisoners received a comprehensive substance misuse assessment from a specialist nurse in reception. Appropriate first night prescribing of opiate substitute medication and alcohol detoxification was available. Most prisoners requiring substance misuse clinical support were located in the specialist house block with daily informal access to clinical and psychosocial staff alongside formal reviews. There was a daily stabilisation clinic to review prisoners undergoing titration or detoxification and good GP access.
- 1.73 A total of 120 prisoners received opiate substitution and 48 were on detoxification programmes. Prescribing was flexible and complied with recognised clinical guidelines. Buprenorphine prescribing that had begun in the community was continued; however administration was carried out in a public area in groups of three prisoners and lacked privacy. Services for prisoners with substance use problems and suffering a mental illness were effective and included a weekly multidisciplinary team meeting to discuss referrals and review care needs. IDTS was available at the open site but there were no prisoners who required it during the inspection.

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 General cleanliness at both sites was unacceptable. Communal areas were dirty and cleaning processes unregulated; cells were poorly decorated and lacked sufficient furniture. Accommodation at the open site was cluttered and unsuitable. Prisoners had little faith in the application system.
- 2.2 At the closed site we saw some particularly appalling dirty areas, which included communal toilets and washing facilities (see appendix V, photograph 3). Shower areas on the closed site were poor, many had paint peeling from walls and ceilings (see appendix V, photograph 2) and there was evidence of mould and insect infestation. Wing cleaners were not supervised and there were no published cleaning schedules; we observed wing areas to be litter strewn and dirty after cleaners had gone to the gymnasium after supposedly completing their tasks (see appendix V, photograph 1). With the notable single exception of the yard used by vulnerable prisoners, outside areas were universally filthy and we observed prisoners exercising in yards strewn with rubbish (see appendix V, photograph 4). We saw staff take no action when rubbish was being thrown from windows. Many prisoners told us that they were concerned about the cleanliness of the prison and complained that they were unable to access adequate cleaning material. Staff acknowledged this was a problem but were unable to explain why this was so (see main recommendation HP48).
- 2.3 Single cells continued to be used for two prisoners on the closed site; there was insufficient furniture and toilets were inadequately screened. Many cells across the site had ill-fitting windows and ventilation panels were either blocked or painted over. Empty cells were left graffiti ridden, unprepared and dirty. Few cells on the closed site had lockable cupboards. The offensive displays policy was not adhered to and transgressions went unchallenged.
- 2.4 Accommodation at the open site was mostly unsuitable; partitioned dormitories were cluttered and most were in a poor state of repair and lacked furniture. Some upper floor dormitories showed evidence of water ingress which was being addressed, and unchanged from 2009, none of the rooms on the upper floor had courtesy locks. Communal areas remained dirty and there was no evidence of regular cleaning. Stairways were particularly poor. The two small annexes at the open site accommodating prisoners nearing the end of their sentence provided much better accommodation.
- 2.5 Consultation arrangements were good across both sites but minutes were not properly disseminated; some of those displayed were almost five years out of date. Access to telephones was good across both sites; however, some lacked privacy hoods. Mail services

were mostly efficient, although there was no recording or monitoring of privileged mail opened in error.

- 2.6 All wings had some association equipment, such as pool tables, most of which was in good order. Clothing and bedding issued weekly were of a reasonable quality and quantity. Some applications for access to stored property had been outstanding for over a month. At the closed site, general applications were only available from wing offices between 8.30am and 9.15am, a busy period during which prisoners also had the opportunity to clean cells, make phone calls and take 30 minutes' outside exercise. Applications could only be handed in during this period and many prisoners found this to be a problem. At the Grange Resettlement Unit, the office was open between 7.20am – 11pm, during which time applications could be submitted.
- 2.7 The triplicate system was not widely understood by either staff or prisoners, and we saw many applications submitted with all three sheets attached. Some of the replies seen were very limited and unnecessarily abrupt. Prisoners had little faith in the system and there was little management oversight and no monitoring. Application rules were generally well communicated to prisoners at both sites during first night and induction procedures.

Recommendations

- 2.8 **Single cells should not be used for double occupancy.** (Repeated recommendation 2.21)
- 2.9 **Dormitory accommodation on the open site should be refurbished and offer appropriate levels of privacy and space.**
- 2.10 **The applications system should be monitored and quality assured by managers.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.11 The offensive displays policy should be enforced.
- 2.12 Telephones should be adequately screened to ensure privacy.

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.

- 2.13 In our survey, most prisoners said that staff treated them with respect but prisoners from some minority groups were less positive. Despite this some wing staff interactions with prisoners we observed were distant with little active engagement. Contact during recreational periods was limited and the lack of engagement was reflected in entries on the Prison Service computer system; they lacked quality and detail and few showed meaningful recorded management checks. However, relationships between staff and specialist staff were good.

- 2.14 In our survey, most prisoners said that staff treated them with respect; 82% of prisoners on the open site said that this was the case, significantly more than during the last inspection (68%). The personal officer scheme had been introduced on the open site since our last inspection.
- 2.15 Black and minority ethnic prisoners on both sites and foreign national prisoners on the closed site were significantly less positive about how respectful staff were towards them. Supervision of prisoners during unlock periods by wing staff was limited. We observed generally distant relationships with little active staff engagement, and on one house block, we saw a member of staff turn his back on a prisoner who had approached him with a reasonable request. Staff rarely engaged with prisoners during association and exercise periods and congregated in offices and staff areas. They did not always challenge inappropriate behaviour, and we saw occasions where officers who watched prisoners throw rubbish did not intervene. In our survey more prisoners than we would expect said that staff did not check on them regularly. We did see some good interactions but these were by no means typical (see main recommendation HP45).
- 2.16 Personal officers had a reasonable knowledge of prisoners. However, the frequency of staff entries in prisoner case notes was variable, did not meet the requirements of the policy and reflected a lack of engagement. There was little reference to prisoners' personal circumstances or sentence planning targets. Management checks were infrequent and did not address the quality of entries. In contrast the relationships we observed between specialist staff and prisoners were generally very good.

Recommendation

- 2.17 Wing file entries should provide evidence of staff engagement, including with sentence planning, and wing managers should carry out regular quality assurance checks of entries in wing history files.

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic⁵ are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

- 2.18 The diversity policy was comprehensive and the action plan up to date. The quarterly equalities committee meeting was usually well attended but there was a lack of coordination of equality and diversity work. Monitoring data on black and minority ethnic prisoners was sufficiently analysed but failed to include other protected characteristics. Discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) were freely available but investigations were of a mixed standard and quality assurance procedures were inadequate. Prisoner equality representatives provided prisoners with valuable support. Procedures for identifying prisoners with diversity needs were adequate although provision was mixed. There were some good support forums.

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

Strategic management

- 2.19 The equality policy was comprehensive and covered all protected characteristics. Overall governance of equality and diversity was uncoordinated with each protected characteristic managed by a different senior manager with little sense of cohesion.
- 2.20 The equality committee met quarterly. Attendance was generally good and included prisoner representatives. All protected characteristics were discussed with a focus on one characteristic at each meeting. The equality action plan was strategic and outlined detail about provision for prisoners under each protected characteristic. The committee considered systematic monitoring and analysis of race equality treatment (SMART) data but there was no monitoring of other protected characteristics. Some SMART data had been out of range during the previous year and analysis of this had been reasonable.
- 2.21 Prisoner representatives met with staff every month to discuss a range of matters; they had received some training and a job description for their role. The role of officers who were supporting diversity had yet to be clarified and none of the officers had been trained. Procedures to identify and alert staff to prisoners convicted of a racially aggravated offence or an incident of racist bullying were good.
- 2.22 In 2011, 115 DIRFs had been submitted, and there had been 97 in the first 10 months of 2012. The prison now checked complaint forms for discrimination and this accounted for a significant number of DIRFs. Most DIRFs concerned low level racial discrimination. Those sampled had not all been investigated sufficiently thoroughly, over half of DIRFS submitted in 2012 had not been dealt with fully and some dated back over six months. We were unable to ascertain whether all prisoners had received responses to their complaints. There was no external scrutiny of DIRFs and internal quality assurance was inadequate; few had been signed off by a senior manager. Equality impact assessments were completed adequately but the completion programme had fallen behind.
- 2.23 The prison employed prisoner diversity representatives who provided prisoners and the equalities team with valuable support. There were some support forums for prisoners from minority groups. Equality and diversity notice boards were up to date and well presented and different cultural events were celebrated. We found that prisoners had inappropriately been asked to contribute financially to participate in events to celebrate Black History Month.

Recommendations

- 2.24 The prison should extend equality monitoring to include all protected characteristics.
- 2.25 Discrimination incident reporting forms should be investigated within a reasonable timescale and prisoners informed of the outcome in writing. Effective quality assurance procedures should be put in place.

Housekeeping points

- 2.26 The role of diversity and race equality officers should be clarified, and specific training provided.
- 2.27 Equality impact assessments should be completed according to the advertised programme.

- 2.28 Prisoners should not have to contribute financially to attend celebratory events.

Protected characteristics

- 2.29 Black and minority ethnic prisoners made up around 27% of the population. In our survey, prisoners on the open site were generally positive across a range of indicators, but those on the closed site were less positive, particularly when asked how safe they felt and how respectfully they were being treated (see section on bullying and violence reduction). Our survey showed that about 5% of the population were from a Gypsy, Roma or Traveller backgrounds. Pertemps, an external organisation, ran a monthly support forum for this group.
- 2.30 Foreign national prisoners made up nearly 15% of the population. Provision for this group was good, particularly from the paid foreign national prisoner representatives. There was a full-time foreign national coordinator supported by a senior officer. Foreign national prisoners in our group appreciated the support they received but were vociferous about the lack of translated information and official interpreting services. The induction booklet had been translated into several languages but was out of date and was not being issued. Records showed that the telephone interpreting service had last been used in July 2012 and only 12 times between April and July 2012. Prisoners were extensively used as interpreters, including for medical screening interviews in reception and adjudications, which was inappropriate. Peer support was provided for foreign national prisoners in English for speakers of other languages classes, another initiative helping them to cope in prison.
- 2.31 UK Border Agency (UKBA) staff were on site and provided two open surgeries a month for any foreign national prisoner who wished to see them. Prisoners could seek independent immigration advice from the Detention Advice Service. Ten prisoners were being held under immigration powers, the longest for 18 months beyond the end of his sentence.
- 2.32 Almost 13% of prisoners were Muslim. In our survey, Muslim prisoners were more positive than others about their religious beliefs being respected.
- 2.33 Prisoners could disclose disabilities during reception and initial identification was good. Provision for prisoners with disabilities was delegated to education, residential and medical staff and the results of assessments coordinated by the equalities manager. Some reasonable adjustments had been made but there were few adequately adapted cells and prisoners with limited mobility could not easily access the chapel or health care unit on the closed site (see section on health services). The open site was generally unsuitable for housing prisoners with limited mobility due to the number of stairs, but the few located there were given accommodation on a lower level. There was no central record of the use of personal emergency and evacuation plans (PEEPs). Despite detailed instructions to staff to complete them, residential staff we spoke to did not understand the system and were unable to show us any completed PEEPS for prisoners who clearly required them. Night staff were not aware of prisoners who might need assistance in an emergency.
- 2.34 Older prisoners were identified and there was evidence of some good care planning for a number of individuals, which included the use of paid carers. There were no specific activities for older prisoners or prisoners with disabilities and those who were retired or unable to work were locked up during the core day. Two wheelchairs were provided in a central area but the protocol was not specific about who would push these if required.
- 2.35 In our survey, 3% of respondents in the open prison and 1% in the closed prison identified themselves as gay or bisexual. The prison had an effective and confidential identification

method. All were seen by the equalities manager and attempts had been made to provide a support forum with little response from prisoners. One transsexual prisoner had been managed using an individual compact addressing specific needs.

Recommendations

- 2.36 Telephone interpreting services should be used for confidential prisoner matters including health care screenings and adjudications.
- 2.37 A range of appropriate wing-based activities should be available for older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities.
- 2.38 Personal emergency evacuation plans should be drawn up for those who need them and staff should be aware of those who require assistance.

Housekeeping point

- 2.39 Information about the prison regime should be available to foreign national prisoners in a language they understand.

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.

- 2.40 The chaplaincy was well integrated into the daily life of the prison. Faith provision included additional activities alongside corporate worship. Chaplaincy facilities were good at both sites.
- 2.41 The chaplaincy, consisting of five full-time chaplains from different faiths plus part-time and fee-paid chaplains, was active and highly regarded among prisoners. The team was well integrated into the prison and delivered good provision for all faiths, including corporate worship and pastoral care.
- 2.42 Facilities on both sites were good and included separate chapels and suitable areas for Friday prayers for Muslim prisoners. Classrooms on the closed site and facilities on the open site were suitable for the wide range of religious study groups and other activities available. All prisoners were seen by chaplaincy staff on reception and advised of the chaplaincy provision. An accredited wellbeing course, which covered loss and bereavement, was run several times a year, followed by one-to-one follow up work by trained counsellors.
- 2.43 The two Imams on the permanent chaplaincy staff reported that Friday prayers and other Muslim activities were well attended and that they were available to see prisoners when requested.

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.

- 2.44 Prisoners generally lacked confidence in the complaints system. Complaint forms were not available on all wings and replies took too long. Monitoring arrangements were good. Some complaints had not been adequately investigated.
- 2.45 Prisoners received information about the complaints process during induction, and further information was displayed across the prison. Complaint forms and envelopes were not available on all wings. Most complaints boxes were emptied by the night orderly officer. Prisoners generally lacked confidence in the complaints system and complained to us about them going missing and not being responded to; we were told that some had gone missing and been found in the security department, rather than going through the complaints system.
- 2.46 In the first six months of 2012, 1,384 complaints had been received. Most complaints related to property. About 8% of complaints were not answered on time. Complaint monitoring was thorough and scrutinised monthly by the senior management team. Daily operational briefings included a complaints report highlighting emerging issues. There were regular management checks of the quality of responses to complaints, and additional scrutiny from the Independent Monitoring Board.
- 2.47 Most complaints were answered by wing managers. Some replies were dismissive and failed to convince us that matters had been investigated. Serious complaints about staff were investigated by senior managers, and responses fully addressed the matters raised. There was no published guidance outlining protection measures for prisoners who had submitted complaints against staff.

Recommendation

- 2.48 All complaints should be properly investigated, and responses should be respectful and prompt.

Housekeeping points

- 2.49 Complaint forms and confidential access envelopes should be readily available beside complaints boxes.
- 2.50 Local guidance should be put in place outlining protection measures for prisoners who have submitted complaints against staff.

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.

2.51 Legal rights provision, including bail information was good. Legal visits arrangements offered privacy and videoconferencing facilities.

2.52 Two dedicated legal rights staff provided services for both sites. They met all new prisoners to offer bail support including referral for accommodation and court bail information. They also provided contact details for legal advisers, court application forms and assistance for prisoners conducting their own cases. Offender supervisors contacted all recalled prisoners, advised them on how to challenge their recall and progress their cases. Prisoners due for release attended a session with an offender supervisor who explained licence requirements and the importance of compliance. There were sufficient legal visits sessions on the closed site for all prisoners. Facilities were good with private interview rooms and video links. Visitors we spoke to told us that booking was efficient and that they did not experience delays in obtaining appointments.

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.

2.53 Positive changes in the delivery of health care had been made since our last inspection, but there were still some important developments that were yet to be completed, including staff recruitment and the control of infection in some areas. Prisoners continued to wait a long time to see a GP, but the range of services available to them was good. The in-patient unit was highly regarded by prisoners. Mental health care was satisfactory but stretched due to overall staff shortages. Pharmacy services were satisfactory but the security of medicines needed addressing. Prisoners had access to a good level of dental care.

Governance arrangements

2.54 Health care services were commissioned by Worcestershire Primary Care Trust with Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust providing all care. Relationships with the commissioners were good. The health care department was well organised and managed. Prisoners in our survey were generally dissatisfied with the quality of health care services and access to them, in particular the long waiting times to see a GP.

2.55 Health care was provided on numerous sites across the prison, including the open site. The health care centre provided clinics, pharmacy and dental services on the upper floor and an in-patient unit on the ground floor. There continued to be a lack of disabled access to the upper

floor. The facilities were very well equipped but some areas still did not meet infection control requirements.

- 2.56 A review of the health needs assessment had been carried out early in 2012 and a new service provider had been in place for more than a year. The large group of staff was divided into three teams covering primary, mental health and substance misuse services. Over 10 vacancies were causing some disruption to the delivery of services, but this was being addressed. Clinical governance arrangements were good and monitored through quarterly meetings chaired by the deputy governor.
- 2.57 Prisoners on the closed site had access to a 24-hour health care service, with nurses, who were based in the in-patient unit and house block (HB) 4 during the night, available to the whole prison. A good range of appropriate clinics were delivered, and one primary care team leader specialised in the care of older prisoners. Mandatory training and continued professional development was managed by team leaders and overseen by the head of health care. All staff were up to date with training, and there was good investment in the development of specialist staff to provide enhanced care, including five specialist nurse prescribers. Clinical supervision was available on a one-to-one basis, but some staff were not opting in to the process yet.
- 2.58 Prisoners were able to see a GP at daily clinics but on the closed site there was a wait of up to 12 days for routine appointments. Prisoners at the open site were usually seen within 48 hours. Out-of-hours cover was provided by the same service that delivered to the local community. Pharmacy stock and prescriptions were provided by a local provider. A pharmacist was present for half the week, supported by a full-time technician and support worker. The provider delivered dental services for four and a half days each week and there was adequate cover. Some prisoners at the open site visited a community dental practice.
- 2.59 Resuscitation equipment, including automated external defibrillators, was widely distributed at five sites around the prison and appropriately stocked. An account of the kit was maintained daily but we saw some discrepancies in the records. Good use was made of the electronic clinical information system SystemOne, which was available in all health care areas apart from the administration area at the open site. A contract for the archiving of records had been established and documentation stored appropriately. Dissemination of appropriate guidelines to staff was organised and national service frameworks were available and used where required.
- 2.60 Prisoners continued to have no access to a dedicated health care forum and the wings did not have health care representatives. The head of health care regularly attended general prisoner consultation groups. Information about health care services for prisoners was very limited. Complaints were generally managed in a professional and sensitive manner although some of those sampled were dealt with less thoroughly, and prisoners were not directed to other services, such as the Patient Advice and Liaison Service.
- 2.61 The head of health care managed the health promotion strategy along with many other tasks but this could have been devolved to improve efficiency. There were a good range of health promotion clinics and measures to manage communicable diseases but there was very limited health promotion information.

Recommendations

- 2.62 Patient access to a GP for a routine appointment should be within an acceptable waiting time of less than two weeks.
- 2.63 Disabled patients should be able to access the health care centre.

Housekeeping points

- 2.64 Prisoners should have access to a dedicated health care forum.
- 2.65 All clinical areas should be cleaned to a standard to comply with infection control.
- 2.66 Recording checks of resuscitation equipment should be consistent.
- 2.67 Information about health care services should be widely available throughout the prison.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.68 There were two health care rooms in reception and access to the mandatory drug testing (MDT) suite, where the GP saw new prisoners. All rooms were in need of refurbishment to meet infection control standards. Health care screening of prisoners was carried out effectively. Prisoners received a leaflet outlining health care services and language interpreting services were available from the provider.
- 2.69 New applications to see a GP were triaged and added to a general list from where they were allocated to specific clinics. More effective control of the waiting times to see a GP could have been taken and applications managed more effectively as there was a sufficient range of nursing staff.
- 2.70 Attendance rates at clinics were satisfactory. Funding had been received for the refurbishment of the waiting room in the health care centre, which was due to be completed in the two months following our inspection. The waiting area in the open site was acceptable. A separate room had been created on the ground floor of the health care centre for vulnerable prisoners waiting for appointments and a new facility was about to open in HB 2, where the majority of vulnerable prisoners would be seen. There were enough escorts for prisoners requiring outside hospital appointments and very few were cancelled.
- 2.71 Prisoners had access to a good range of vaccination and screening clinics. The smoking cessation service had been reduced due to the staffing situation, which had resulted in a backlog of prisoners waiting to attend the course. Those with lifelong conditions had access to clinics delivered by qualified specialist health care staff.
- 2.72 The in-patient unit provided 16 cells, plus two gated constant watch cells (see section on suicide and self-harm), which were managed separately by the prison, but at times included prisoners with a health care need. The unit was full during our inspection and occupancy averaged 10 prisoners, with an equal split between those needing physical and mental health care. The unit was well equipped and cells were adequately furnished. Prisoners were very complimentary about the unit and their care. Two large rooms used for association and

communal dining ensured that patients were out of their cells for much of the day when they were physically able.

Pharmacy

- 2.73 There were appropriate pharmacy policies and procedures. A medicines and therapeutics committee met quarterly with representatives from both the pharmacy medicines provider and the pharmacist. Approximately 60% of patients received their medication in possession. Risk assessments were not always included on patients' records on SystemOne. Good procedures were in place for re-ordering medication. Pharmacy staff reported that lockable storage facilities for medicines were not available in the cells and not all cells were single occupancy.
- 2.74 Medication was dispensed twice a day and night sedation was usually administered three days in possession. Wherever possible, once-daily preparations were prescribed to overcome problems of limited supervision. The prescribing of tradable medicines such as gabapentin was low and these medicines were not allowed in possession. Prisoners were able to obtain a limited supply of some medicines, including paracetamol, from the canteen. HB 4 was the main block receiving controlled drugs, but the controlled drugs register did not comply with regulations. Vulnerable prisoners were seen in the upper medical unit; however, privacy there was inadequate.
- 2.75 Clinical governance and stock auditing procedures were generally good. Medicines supplied under the simple medications policy were not, however, separated from general stock. Fridge temperatures were not always recorded every day and no explanation was given for times when the temperature was outside the specified limits for the storage of fridge items.
- 2.76 We observed nurses re-dispensing labelled medication to another patient which was not appropriate. The treatment room in the closed site was dirty and in poor decorative order; in HB 2 the temperature in the treatment room was too high for the storage of medicines. The treatment room in the in-patient unit was not secure, nor was the gate to the main dispensary. Staff reported that this gate and the door into the treatment room were frequently left open. Medication use reviews were not routinely offered to prisoners and there was no pharmacy input into clinics. Prisoners were however able to consult the pharmacist if she was on the premises at the time of the request.

Recommendations

- 2.77 Risk assessments for all patients receiving their medication in possession should be included on SystemOne.
- 2.78 All areas where medication is administered should be secured by a double-gated system.
- 2.79 All medicines should be administered from their original packaging or from that labelled for a specific patient in accordance with current regulations.
- 2.80 Secure lockable medicines storage facilities should be provided for all prisoners who receive their medication in possession.
- 2.81 Pharmacy-led clinics and medicine use reviews should be introduced.

Housekeeping points

- 2.82 Fridge temperatures should be recorded daily and explanations provided when these are outside the specified guidelines.
- 2.83 All medicines should be stored to comply with regulations.
- 2.84 All rooms used for medicines storage and administration should be fit for purpose and clean and all medicines should be stored in conditions compliant with their product licence.
- 2.85 The main receiving block for controlled drugs should have a legally compliant controlled drugs register.
- 2.86 Procedures should be put in place to ensure vulnerable prisoners receive appropriate privacy and confidentiality when receiving their medication.

Dentistry

- 2.87 The dental surgery consisted of one large room, which had been refurbished since our last inspection. All equipment was in good order and well maintained. A total of 159 prisoners were on the waiting list, some of whom had been waiting for eight weeks. We were informed that the list had been affected by staff sickness and was usually much smaller. Attendance rates were good and prisoners were satisfied with the level of care they received. We observed a very professional service with good interactions with prisoners who were provided with a wide range of treatment options. In addition to oral health promotion, which was provided 'in the chair', a dental health educator was employed to deliver a weekly session to up to 10 prisoners at a time outlining dental hygiene. Good use was made of SystmOne to record dental treatment and manage the appointment list.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.88 A broad range of services was provided by a large team of 12 mental health nurses with two senior mental health nurse leads and support from health care assistants. In addition to providing primary and secondary mental health care they also staffed the in-patient unit, reception and HB 6. Due to staff shortages, they also supported substance use services. These extra demands increased the pressure on the delivery of a consistent secondary care service and prisoners did not always receive continuity of care from nurses managing their own caseload. The integrated team now had better facilities on HB 4 and saw prisoners at a variety of locations throughout the prison. The caseload consisted of 135 prisoners and there were about 25 new referrals every week.
- 2.89 Cases were managed by a multidisciplinary team, which held a meeting every week that was well attended by representatives from other relevant departments. Two visiting psychiatrists provided four sessions each week for up to 40 patients. Prisoners continued to have no access to day care facilities. Over the previous 12 months, there had been 32 transfers to secure mental health units. Most had been managed swiftly, with a small number waiting up to eight weeks. Mental health records were managed using SystmOne and those sampled were well written and demonstrated that prisoners were involved in their own care planning. There was no programme of mental health awareness training for prison staff and prisoners had no access to professional counselling services.

Recommendations

- 2.90 Day care services should be available for prisoners who need additional therapeutic support for emotional, behavioural and mental health problems.
- 2.91 Prisoners should have access to professional counselling services.
- 2.92 Mental health awareness training should be delivered to all prison 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.

- 2.93 Many prisoners said they did not like the food. There were suitable arrangements to ensure that food for vulnerable prisoners was not contaminated. Prisoners had no opportunity to eat meals out of their cells at the closed site. The dining hall at the open site was grubby and too small. Breakfast packs were issued the day before they were eaten.
- 2.94 There were separate catering arrangements at the closed and open sites; both kitchens were clean and reasonably maintained. Many prisoners told us that they did not like the food. Lunch and dinner were selected from a four-week rolling menu offering a reasonable variety of healthy options, including fruit and vegetables every day. Most meals were cooked from fresh ingredients and there was little use of pre-prepared food. Bread was baked daily at the closed site. Menus generally met the needs of different diets and catered for a wide range of cultural needs. Breakfast packs were issued the day before they were to be eaten at the closed site and there were no facilities for prisoners to eat out of their cells. At the open site the dining room was too small to accommodate all prisoners, and generally looked run-down.
- 2.95 There were regular meetings with servery workers and a twice-yearly food survey on both sites. The catering manager attended prisoner consultation meetings. Prisoners had access to food comments books. The catering manager had met prisoner representatives on the vulnerable prisoner units to discuss fears about food contamination in the kitchen, and effective safeguards were in place to ensure that food was not tampered with. All staff and prisoners were correctly dressed and trained.
- 2.96 There were inadequate opportunities for prisoners in the open site annexes, who were preparing for release after long sentences, to cater for themselves. Given their imminent release, this would have provided worthwhile opportunities to develop independent living skills further.

Recommendations

- 2.97 There should be facilities to allow prisoners to eat their meals out of their cells on the closed site.
- 2.98 Prisoners in the open site annexes should have opportunities to cook for themselves.

Housekeeping point

- 2.99 Conditions in the dining room at the closed site should be improved.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

2.100 New prisoners waited too long to access ordered goods and survey results were very negative in relation to the range of provision. Catalogue processes had improved.

2.101 Canteen provision was subject to a national contract. Depending on their day of arrival, prisoners could wait for up to 16 days to receive their first order. Prisoners told us that this could lead to debts and bullying. Smokers' and non-smokers' packs were available from reception and newly arrived prisoners could apply for additional packs to carry them through this period (see main recommendation HP45).

2.102 In our survey, prisoners were significantly more negative than in comparator prisons about the range of goods provided, and none of the Muslim respondents in the open prison thought it met their needs. A common complaint during the inspection was the lack of fresh fruit on the canteen list. Prisoners were consulted about provision at prisoner consultation meetings and there was evidence that this had an impact on canteen provision.

2.103 Newspapers could be ordered through a local newsagent and were delivered to prisoners on the day of publication. Catalogue provision was limited to three or four, but processes were expedient and prisoners usually received goods within two weeks of placing the order.

Recommendations

- 2.104 Fresh fruit should be available through the prison shop. (Repeated recommendation 8.16)
- 2.105 New prisoners should have access to a full canteen order after arrival at the prison.

Housekeeping point

- 2.106 The negative perception of the range of goods available should be explored.

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.⁶

- 3.1 There was regular slippage of the regime. Too many prisoners were locked up during the core day. Association periods were regularly cancelled or curtailed. Exercise periods were too short. The open site had an open regime with adequate time outside.
- 3.2 Prisoners were generally negative about time out of cell. During roll checks on the closed site we found more than 53% of prisoners locked up, and observed scheduled cancellations of association periods and late unlocking on each evening of the inspection. Exercise periods, for a little under 30 minutes a day took place on bare, filthy litter strewn exercise yards. Exercise was regularly cancelled if it was raining. Prisoners located in segregation and the health care department had access to an hour's exercise each day.
- 3.3 The regime allowed for a maximum of nine and a half hours of time out of cell for fully employed prisoners. In practice this applied to very few other than approximately 130 wing cleaners, who at best, worked for little more than an hour a day. Remand prisoners had access to a maximum of around five hours out of cell if they went to their morning gymnasium session. Otherwise this was limited to less than three hours. Retired and disabled prisoners were unnecessarily locked up during the core day. The regime at the open site was much better and there was good access to time in the open air and general activities.

Recommendations

- 3.4 All prisoners should be given an hour's exercise outside each day. (Repeated recommendation 6.63)
- 3.5 The core day should be adhered to and regime activities maximised, including for those beyond retirement age, to ensure the minimum number of prisoners are left locked up during the working day.

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

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

after their sentence. The learning and skills and work provision is of a good standard and is effective in meeting the needs of all prisoners.

3.6 The management of learning and skills was good but there were insufficient activity places for the population. Achievement of education and vocational qualifications was high. Teaching and coaching was good, with some outstanding aspects. Partnership working was impressive and greatly benefited prisoners. The induction and allocation process for education, vocational training and work activities was undermined by informal ad hoc arrangements. On the closed site this contributed to a low number in some education classes and poor punctuality and attendance in many areas. The unreliable electricity supply affected safe working conditions at the farm. Purposeful activity opportunities remained poor for vulnerable prisoners. The libraries were much improved and were good. Access to recreational physical education (PE) was good for mainstream prisoners, but restricted to the range of accredited courses.

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

Outcomes for prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work activities:	Good
Quality of learning and skills and work activities, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment:	Good
Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities:	Good

Management of learning and skills and work

3.8 Management had retained the key strengths that had been identified at the previous inspection, although this was undermined by there being insufficient activity places at the closed site, which meant many prisoners spent most of the day with little purposeful to do. The clear vision and focus on preparation for employment on release and the particularly effective partnership working had enabled the very good catering, construction crafts and motor cycle repair vocational training to be retained in 2011 when house block (HB) 7 closed. Further positive initiatives had been introduced, such as dogs for the hearing impaired.

3.9 Effective management of education had continued when in August 2012, Milton Keynes College took over the contract. Recording and use of data had improved since the last inspection. Action to improve attendance and punctuality was not being adequately supported by prison staff and impacted negatively on learning.

3.10 Production workshops were well managed and included the transfer of materials to maintain workflow when some workshop deliveries were erratic. Wing cleaners and rubbish collectors were poorly managed and residential areas and exercise yards were dirty (see section on residential units.) The dairy herd was well managed and reflected realistic land-based working conditions. However, prison managers had taken inadequate action to address the unreliable electricity supply to the farm, which disrupted milking and put prisoners in unsafe, dark confined spaces when dealing with livestock.

3.11 Quality assurance arrangements were generally good and supported the annual self-assessment and action planning process well. The majority of recommendations from the

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

previous inspection had been achieved. However, the training needs analysis was insufficiently detailed and observations of teaching and learning were not always identifying action points for further improvement.

Provision of activities

- 3.12 There were insufficient activity places (676) at the closed site to fully engage all 724 sentenced prisoners; some were fully employed but others were not involved at all. Places were available for remand and convicted prisoners, although around 370 were unemployed. There were 105 full-time places in industry contract workshops and 340 prison jobs. Our closed site prisoner survey showed more thought their prison job would help them on release than in comparator prisons. Vocational training places were available in construction crafts and industrial cleaning and there were 140 education places. Six mathematics peer prisoner mentors were based at the closed site, 10 helped in classrooms and seven were Toe by Toe mentors.
- 3.13 The open site had adequate places and there was full employment, with 172 activity places and 40-50 prisoners released on temporary licence every day for education, training and work purposes (see section on strategic management of resettlement). The site had 119 work places, including jobs on the wings and in the farm and gardens. Nineteen prisoners were involved in paid employment in the community, 12 were looking for work and 28 were carrying out community service work. In our survey of the open site around the same number as in 2009 thought their prison job would help them on release, fewer than in comparator prisons. The site had vocational training places in motorcycle repair and brickwork and 11 prisoners were at local colleges on vocational courses. There were 36 education places. Three prisoners supported their peers in classrooms and two were Toe by Toe mentors.
- 3.14 On both sites, prisoners in other prison areas received education support to improve their literacy and numeracy skills. The effectiveness of allocations was being undermined by informal arrangements, which meant that prisoners were withdrawn from allocated sessions or failed to be challenged when they refused to attend. Education and work provision for vulnerable prisoners was poor and not equitable with other prisoners. No vocational training was available to this group. The first five Storybook Dad CDs had been recorded with support from the prison's family team.

Recommendations

- 3.15 The number of vocational qualifications should be increased at both sites, either separately and/or through training in prison work, to prepare prisoners for further training on release or employment.
- 3.16 The learning and skills and work provision for vulnerable prisoners should be sufficient to meet their individual learning needs in preparation for further training and/or employment.

Quality of provision

- 3.17 Education teaching had improved and was good and there were some outstanding aspects. Teachers' preparation for classes, target setting and the recording of learning that took place were good and good feedback was provided. Paper-based resources were used imaginatively, which motivated learning, and information technology was used well to stimulate learning. Teachers were skilled in managing mixed ability groups.

- 3.18 The quality of individual coaching and group training in vocational workshops and prison work areas was good. Vocational trainers were particularly skilled in using their occupational knowledge and skills as well as the resources to engage and motivate prisoners. Construction and catering vocational training were particularly impressive. The industrial cleaning workshop on the open site was not fit for purpose and the farm classroom offered a poor learning environment.
- 3.19 The good range of subjects and levels of accredited educational and vocational awards across the whole prison was well publicised using a high quality prospectus, wall displays and the in-cell TV channel. However, there were too few places in each subject and too little take-up of vocational training awards for skills gained through work, such as the range of accredited awards offered through work on the farm.
- 3.20 Partnership working across prison areas was good, for example between the education staff and the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service team to deliver drug and alcohol awareness programmes. Useful external links had been forged, such as those with a local radio station to provide training that significantly enhanced prisoners' employability.
- 3.21 Prisoners were well supported by education staff to improve their English and mathematics skills and knowledge, without leaving their work areas. Staff had good skills to support specific learning needs, such as dyslexia, or were speakers of a range of additional languages enabling them to provide additional support.
- 3.22 Prisoners' initial literacy and numeracy assessment scores were entered onto a centrally accessible computer system, enabling staff to provide appropriate support. It was unclear whether staff across the prison were aware of the impact of low ability levels on prisoners' work and life skills and restrictions these might place on progress into employment on release. Standards of behaviour were good, and prisoners and staff demonstrated a high level of mutual respect in all learning and skills and work areas.

Housekeeping point

- 3.23 National definitions of literacy and numeracy levels and what these mean for adults should be circulated to all prison staff to help them understand the impact of prisoners' literacy and numeracy initial assessment scores.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.24 Qualifications achievement for those in activities was very good in both education and vocational subjects. Prisoners' standard of work was good and was particularly impressive in art.
- 3.25 Prisoners developed good employability, vocational and personal skills through their participation in training and workshop activities. There were good opportunities for progression to roles with higher levels of responsibility, for example, in contract workshops, prisoners supervised their peers and developed further skills. Low numbers in some education classes and poor attendance and punctuality at activities, mostly due to regime inefficiencies, remained a concern. Prisoners were also removed from sessions to attend other regime activities which disrupted learning.

- 3.26 New skills and knowledge gained through work in the farms and gardens were insufficiently recorded and recognised. In particular opportunities in horticulture in the extensive ornamental gardens and unused fields could have been used to offer prisoners relevant personal and vocational skills, including those promoting self-sufficiency and business enterprise in preparation for life and employment on release.

Recommendations

- 3.27 Punctuality and attendance at education classes should be improved by more efficient action by prison staff to ensure prisoners attend classes.
- 3.28 The new systems for recognising and recording non-accredited skills gained by prisoners in prison work areas and working out should be fully implemented. (Repeated recommendation 6.34)

Library

- 3.29 The libraries on the closed and open sites were good and well-managed. Stock was varied and appropriate and had been improved to include more vocational books and careers guides. There were good stocks of newspapers, including relevant foreign languages. The introduction of donated magazines had been a success. Libraries had a good range of legal textbooks and relevant Prison Service Orders. They offered a wide range of fiction, books in minority ethnic languages, dictionaries, large print books, easy-to-read and children's books. Books in Braille were also available and the range of CDs was satisfactory. They were well equipped with computers with a variety of popular software. The issue system had yet to be automated to allow for effective tracking of library use, although at the open site a new self-issue computerised facility was being piloted for a national company as an innovative prison library development.
- 3.30 Prisoners at the open site had extensive access to the library seven days a week, including evenings. The library's move to an accessible ground floor location was reflective of excellent community resources. Vulnerable prisoners had a small library on their house block and limited access to the main library.
- 3.31 The libraries were part of the main induction and library use was good. There was an inter-library loan system to provide access to books that were not stocked. Stock loss was low. The writer-in-residence had been excellent and had offered a wide range of activities to stimulate and extend prisoners' interest in literacy; they promoted and celebrated prisoners' new found literacy skills throughout the prison, including through the publication of a range of useful booklets featuring prisoners' work. A variety of other activities had also taken place, for example, celebrations of national events, promoting the use of the library further.

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.

- 3.32 Pass rates on accredited courses were high, but too few prisoners took these and access was restricted. Access to recreational activities was good, but only 66% of the population used them. We were not confident that that best use was being made of the facilities. Vulnerable prisoners had too little provision and even this was underused. The provision had not been adequately reviewed to explore alternative ways of working, including how to better manage the facilities at the open site.
- 3.33 Pass rates for accredited courses were generally high. However, the range of accredited courses at levels 1 and 2 were offered on a linear annual programme, one course at a time, which restricted access. A recommendation from the previous inspection to improve access had not been achieved.
- 3.34 Induction to PE facilities at both sites was appropriate. Staff were well qualified and had gained relevant teaching qualifications. Three prisoners had qualified as health trainers and were providing good individual support working with around 25 prisoners. Only 66% of the population used the PE facilities, although this was a minor improvement since 2009. We were not confident that best use was being made of the facilities, especially as access was good at both sites for mainstream prisoners.
- 3.35 Closed site facilities were open seven days a week and four week day evenings. The accommodation consisted of a large sports hall with designated rooms for weights and cardiovascular equipment and an outdoor all-weather football pitch. The changing facilities were generally appropriate, however the showers did not have privacy screens and prisoners tended to use wing facilities instead. Access to PE facilities for vulnerable prisoners still required improvement. Their two sessions were on weekend mornings, one thoughtlessly at the time of the popular chapel service. Plans to divide part of the fitness area in the health care department to provide alternative PE facilities were unfulfilled despite materials having been bought four months earlier.
- 3.36 At the open site PE was available every evening and at weekends, as prisoners were at education, training and work during the core day. The facilities were good and offered a free weights and a cardiovascular area. The internal decoration of the gym was in a poor state of repair and required attention. The changing facilities were adequate, but showers did not have privacy screens. New well equipped classroom facilities had been developed and a treatment room was available. Outside facilities were good and provided a five-a-side floodlit football field and a full-size pitch, which was used for community football as part of the local football league. Reduced staffing due to operational pressures had not been managed sufficiently well and the provision had not been adequately reviewed to explore alternative ways of working, including how to better manage the facilities at the open site.

Recommendations

- 3.37 **The PE provision should undergo a review to ensure staffing is being used efficiently and effectively and that it is better meeting the needs of the population and supporting prisoners in preparing for employment in the fitness industry.**
- 3.38 **Vulnerable prisoners should have access to the same number of PE sessions as other prisoners (Repeated recommendation 6.49)**
- 3.39 **The internal deterioration of the PE building on the open site should be improved.**

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 resettlement strategy was comprehensive and provision was informed by needs analyses. Management arrangements were sound. Release on temporary licence was used on the open site but too few prisoners were given this opportunity.

4.2 The comprehensive resettlement strategy addressed offender management, resettlement pathways and community links. It incorporated an action plan for each pathway and lead managers were identified, some of whom were employed by community based organisations. The strategy did not explicitly explain how a needs analysis had informed its development. However, we did see evidence of prisoner surveys and analysis of the population, which guided its implementation. Examples included identifying the population's home areas, so that community links could be focused, and analysing types of offence to inform the development of interventions. Information collected for sentenced prisoners' offender assessment system (OASYS) documents had been used for a regional prisoner needs analysis, which was also driving the development of interventions. Management groups concerned with different aspects of resettlement had been drawn together in one bi-monthly meeting. This included community representatives and appropriate prison departments. It was well attended and lead staff for pathways and offender management reported on the progress of their action plans.

4.3 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was rarely used on the closed site. On the open site only 30 prisoners were in college or paid employment; 11 at college and 19 in paid employment. This represented only 16% of the site's population, which is much lower than we usually see at open prisons. ROTL was also used on the open site for overnight and day release to support resettlement and unpaid community work. In our survey, only 57% reported that they had had access to day release compared with 67% in comparator open prisons; 47% said that they had had access to overnight release compared with 62% in comparator open prisons.

Recommendation

4.4 More opportunities should be developed for prisoners to access ROTL for college and employment purposes.

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.

- 4.5 Most prisoners had a sentence plan but many OASYS assessments were late. There was regular contact with high risk offenders but this was much more variable for low and medium risk prisoners. The quality of assessments and relevance of targets was reasonable. There was no comprehensive custody planning for short-term and remand prisoners but their needs were assessed. Home detention curfew (HDC) and public protection were well managed. Categorisation reviews were timely. Indeterminate sentence prisoners were provided with opportunities to progress and parole reports were up to date.
- 4.6 Although the prison did not have a separate strategy for offender management, the resettlement strategy contained a full and detailed offender management section that set out its priorities and organisation. Most eligible prisoners had sentence plans.
- 4.7 In files sampled, sentence plan minutes were not recorded properly. Attendance at sentence planning meetings needed improvement, for example while CARAT staff attended regularly where required, programme delivery staff rarely did. Unsentenced prisoners and those sentenced to less than 12 months did not have a sentence or custody plan but an assessment of their resettlement needs was completed and referrals made to appropriate services (see section on reintegration planning). Low and medium risk prisoners sentenced to more than 12 months had an OASYS document and sentence plan targets were set, but there was no structured continuing contact with offender supervisors to oversee their progress.
- 4.8 High risk prisoners, those categorised as persistent prolific offenders (PPOs) and those subject to indeterminate public protection sentences (IPPs) were allocated to offender managers in the community who prepared their risk assessments. These prisoners had regular contact with prison-based offender supervisors and cases examined revealed this to have been constructive and purposeful. However, the involvement of offender managers was variable; there was evidence of some good communication and involvement in sentence planning, but also examples where prisoners had not been allocated an offender manager.
- 4.9 In our survey 50% of prisoners on the closed site and 20% on the open site reported that they had had no contact with their offender manager, which was more than in comparator prisons (40% and 12% respectively). Although caseloads for offender supervisors on both sites were reasonable at around 30, supervisors were often redeployed to residential or other duties. We were told that in the month prior to the inspection, 27 days of offender supervisor time had been lost to redeployment.
- 4.10 Many OASYS documents were completed later than their due date. In the six months prior to the inspection, 112 (32.3%) were late on the closed site and 16 (22.5%) on the open site. A number of these were the responsibility of community-based offender managers and there were good systems in place for chasing late assessments. In the month prior to the inspection there were 25 late assessments on the closed site and four on the open site. The quality of assessments was reasonable or good and sentence plan targets were relevant and realistic.

- 4.11 Offender supervisors had received appropriate training but we were not assured about the professional supervision they received. There were plans to develop peer support but these could not progress until the future staffing of the unit under a Prison Service staff reorganisation had been determined.
- 4.12 HDC procedures were sound, late contributions were chased promptly and decisions were reasonable in the cases seen. In the six months prior to the inspection, 53 had been granted and 41 refused. Of these, in 44 cases, decisions had been made after their eligibility date. The reasons were monitored and we found that all but one were due to reasons beyond the prison's control.

Recommendations

- 4.13 All eligible prisoners should have a sentence plan and OASYS assessments should be completed on time.
- 4.14 There should be ongoing recorded contact with all prisoners to oversee the achievement of sentence plans and resettlement targets.

Housekeeping points

- 4.15 Sentence planning meetings should be fully minuted.
- 4.16 Offender supervisors should receive formalised professional supervision and feedback.

Public protection

- 4.17 Public protection procedures were well managed, robust and well established. The public protection team was notified of all new arrivals and those identified as potential risks to the public were interviewed. Prisoners were informed of the reasons for the concern, the restrictions in place and how to challenge them or apply for contact with children where relevant.
- 4.18 Telephone monitoring was reviewed monthly and removed when it showed that the prisoner was complying with restrictions. Where prisoners were communicating in languages other than English recordings were translated by a professional. Monthly interdepartmental risk management meetings were well attended and reports from the security department were considered. Minutes of meetings demonstrated that a full range of information was considered and appropriate actions planned.
- 4.19 There was good preparation for release. All prisoners were reviewed six months prior to release and an assessment was completed of those with a history of domestic violence and no ongoing supervision; this was shared with police, probation and relevant multi-agency groups. Public protection staff provided information to community based multi-agency forums and attended local meetings.

Categorisation

- 4.20 Categorisation procedures were efficient and timely. Information from a wide range of prison departments was considered and where a change of category was refused, the reasons were

fully detailed in writing to the prisoner. Although prisoners could make written representations, they could not attend a categorisation board.

- 4.21 Prisoners were transferred from the open site appropriately but there were difficulties moving some prisoners because of a lack of space for certain categories and offence types. Offender management unit staff took proactive action to address this issue.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.22 Prisoners on indeterminate sentences at the closed site were located appropriately and were either completing sentence plan targets or awaiting transfer to other establishments. All prisoners remanded on charges likely to attract an indeterminate sentence were seen by a dedicated offender supervisor and provided with sentence information. Offender supervisors responsible for indeterminate sentence prisoners had received suitable training, and probation officers prepared reports to the parole board.
- 4.23 In the open site a structured approach provided indeterminate sentence prisoners with opportunities to progress to release through periods of temporary release. Indeterminate sentence prisoners were offered regular forums but they were not well attended because most prisoners communicated with staff regularly.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.24 Resettlement needs were assessed on arrival and pre-release. Services to support accommodation and finance, benefit and debt issues were effective. There were good information, advice and guidance services and careers guidance at the open site. Prior to discharge prisoners received ongoing medication, information about NHS facilities and a letter for their GP. Drug and alcohol policies existed, but there was no formal action plan to address identified gaps in provision. Group work opportunities were good on both sites and there were very positive links with local 'recovery partnerships'. There was a good range of courses to support family life, but offending behaviour programmes did not meet all the prisoners' needs. The restorative justice project was an excellent initiative.

- 4.25 A brief assessment of all newly received prisoners identified their resettlement needs. Referrals were made to resettlement services but there was no ongoing contact with remand prisoners or those serving short sentences. Offender supervisors undertook a further assessment of prisoners sentenced to more than 12 months. Approximately four weeks prior to release, sentenced prisoners on the closed site were offered a pre-release course, which covered enduring resettlement needs in good time for remedial action.

Accommodation

- 4.26 The National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (Nacro) was responsible for the accommodation support pathway. The service had a significant impact on outcomes for

prisoners with 94% going on to settled accommodation. Those who were released without accommodation were generally prisoners serving short sentences, where there was insufficient time to make adequate arrangements. A prisoner peer adviser worked closely with Nacro on house block (HB) 4 and the foreign national prisoner representatives assisted on HB 6. A weekly drop in service was available on the open site.

- 4.27 All prisoners were seen during induction to ascertain their housing needs. Prisoners could also see Nacro staff on application at any time during their sentence. Advice focused on managing tenancy debt and related issues, along with guidance on housing applications. All convicted prisoners were also seen during the pre-release course four weeks prior to release and assessed to ensure settled accommodation was available.

Education, training and employment

- 4.28 The clear focus on resettlement from the previous inspection had been maintained in the education, training and employment (ETE) offered across the prison. The information, advice and guidance service was good. Although the service had been refocused on the closed site, owing to reduced resources, it aimed to motivate unemployed prisoners to join ETE activities.
- 4.29 At the open site the careers guidance continued to have a strong focus on resettlement support, including signposting for applications for financial support to help prisoners take distance learning courses or pay for travel to college courses. The multi-agency and multi-resource approach supported prisoners well in researching and applying for work and college courses.
- 4.30 The strong partnership working with City and South Birmingham College in particular was good and the majority of prisoners progressing onto college courses appreciated their construction training. The mandatory employability course at the open site, a requirement for participation in community work, was insufficiently challenging. Prisoners on college courses wanted a prison job that complemented their training and used their new skills; others were frustrated at not being allocated to activities, where they could use existing skills to help community groups, while completing community service work.

Recommendation

- 4.31 **The mandatory employability courses should be reviewed to provide better preparation for community service work and progression to training or paid employment.**

Health care

- 4.32 Health care staff were informed three days before the release of a prisoner, which meant there was sufficient time to make any necessary preparations for discharge. All prisoners were seen in reception prior to discharge and provided with any ongoing medication, information about NHS facilities and a letter for their GP. Those with enduring mental health problems were managed appropriately. Procedures were available for the care of terminally ill prisoners.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.33 The drug and alcohol strategy was well coordinated. Up-to-date policies were informed by a needs analysis, but lacked an explicit action plan. Key stakeholders failed to attend the drug

strategy meetings consistently (see section on security). South Shropshire NHS Trust provided psychosocial services through the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service, but Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust had secured the psychosocial contract. The transfer to an integrated recovery-centred psychosocial and clinical service had been planned for 1 November 2012, but had been delayed indefinitely, which had generated a reduction in service provision.

- 4.34 The CARAT team consisted of 16 workers with an active caseload of 336, with a further 143 prisoners assessed but awaiting allocation. Most referrals were seen within one working day. There were appropriate management and supervision arrangements and the service was integrated well into the prison.
- 4.35 Group work opportunities were good. A weekly relapse prevention and harm minimisation group and CARAT induction sessions were delivered at the open site. Groups available on the closed site included the short duration drug programme (SDP) and the control of violence for angry impulsive drinkers (COVAID) course. However both courses were being wound up and no alternative was available until the new service provider took over. Alcoholics Anonymous ran weekly groups throughout the prison. CARAT workers delivered varied short courses on motivation, relapse prevention, harm reduction and alcohol.
- 4.36 Very good links existed with local 'recovery partnerships' (RPs) (formerly drug intervention programmes), and several RP representatives regularly attended the prison to run resettlement surgeries. CARAT staff consistently attended sentence planning boards and risk management meetings.

Recommendation

- 4.37 **A formal action plan to address the gaps in provision identified within the drug and alcohol needs analysis should be developed and there should be a formal progress review process within the monthly drug strategy meeting.**

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.38 The Citizens Advice Bureau provided prisoners with support in financial matters. The service was comprehensive and covered debt, advice about money management and help with writing letters to financial institutions. Advice and assistance were also provided to prisoners' families. The facility to open a bank account had started two weeks prior to our inspection and six had been opened during that time.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.39 Provision for social visits at both sites was very good and included evening visits once a week for most prisoners. At the closed site, convicted prisoners could have a weekly one-hour visit, and unconvicted prisoners could have a daily visit. At both sites new arrivals were entitled to a reception visit that did not need to be pre-booked, and prisoners at the open site were able to use visiting orders from previous prisons.
- 4.40 As in 2009, visits at the closed site could only be booked by telephone and prisoners were unable to exchange unused visiting orders for additional telephone credit. Telephone booking lines were open on every week day. We accessed the line after a long wait on our third attempt

and visitors confirmed that they experienced long waits. Prisoners at the open site booked their own visits.

- 4.41 The visitors' centre was a very good facility. Family support workers based there were friendly and helpful and there was an extensive range of useful information on display. The visits room at the closed site was large and well decorated, but most chairs were worn and grubby. The closed visits area at the closed site was clean and was usually only used following good intelligence information. However, a single drug dog indication without any other intelligence would lead to a closed visit only. The number of prisoners on closed visits – about 20 at the time of the inspection – appeared appropriate and all cases were properly authorised and monitored.
- 4.42 At the closed site visits often started late, taking up to an hour from arrival at the main gate to the start of a visit. Visitors and prisoners we spoke to said that this was usual. Community transport, with several local pick-up points continued to be available for visitors. Visits at the open site were held in the main hall. The environment was good with supervised play areas. In good weather prisoners and visitors could access the prison grounds.
- 4.43 There was a comprehensive action plan to develop work under the children and families pathway with a designated lead member of staff. A well-resourced team delivered an extensive range of family-based activities across the two sites, led by the chaplaincy. The work was supported by a full-time coordinator, play coordinators as well as teams of play workers and family support workers.
- 4.44 A good range of courses and activities were provided across the prison, including Storybook Dads, baby bonding visits, family time visits, parenting courses and card making clubs. All prisoners, regardless of their incentives and earned privilege scheme status, were eligible to attend family visits.

Recommendations

- 4.45 **Visits should start at the advertised time.** (Repeated recommendation 9.109)
- 4.46 **Closed visits should be authorised only when there is significant risk justified by security intelligence.** (Repeated recommendation 9.110)
- 4.47 **Visitors should be able to book their next visit while they are at the establishment** (Repeated recommendation 9.106)

Housekeeping point

- 4.48 The condition of furniture in the visits hall at the closed site should be improved.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.49 The thinking skills programme (TSP) was provided on the closed site and the waiting list was manageable. Prisoners attending programmes could continue with their employment or were paid a wage for attendance so that they were not disadvantaged. Two locally approved courses addressing bereavement and anger control had been a valuable resource for lower risk prisoners. However, these had been suspended due to staff shortages.

- 4.50 There had been some analysis of local need and the responsible manager was involved in regional planning and analysing interventions. However, appropriate interventions were insufficient. Prisoners on the open site could attend programmes on the closed site and attend community-based programmes in Birmingham.
- 4.51 An impressive restorative justice project operated on both sites. The main element was the Supporting Offenders Through Restoration Inside (SORI) course, which ran four times a year and involved 12 prisoners. Attendance by community and victim representatives was an essential element of the programme. Restorative interventions were also used with prisoners individually to resolve interpersonal conflict.

Recommendation

- 4.52 The range of interventions available should be broadened to meet the needs of the prison population.

Good practice

- 4.53 *The restorative justice interventions were innovative and effective.*

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.

Main recommendations

To the governor

-
- 5.1 Staff should actively engage with and supervise prisoners so that anti-social behaviour is challenged, violence reduction policies are consistently implemented and risks to prisoner safety are identified and reduced. (HP45)
 - 5.2 A drug and alcohol supply reduction strategy should be developed/reviewed which should include the application of a consistent testing regime, effective use of intelligence and co-ordination between the relevant departments. (HP46)
 - 5.3 Monitoring data about safety issues, including violence reduction, findings from investigations about self-harm incidents and deaths in custody should be effectively collated and used to inform the local strategy to improve safety overall. (HP47)
 - 5.4 Standards of cleanliness in all areas should be significantly improved and maintained, and facilities refurbished to an acceptable standard. (HP48)
 - 5.5 Sufficient activity places should be provided at the closed site so that all sentenced prisoners can be fully engaged. (HP49)

Recommendation

To Prisoner Escort and Custody Service

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.6 Prisoners should be held in court cells for the minimum period possible. (1.5, repeated recommendation 1.13)

Recommendations

To the governor

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.7 Subject to risk assessment and status, prisoners should receive 24 hours' notice of planned transfers. (1.6, repeated recommendation 1.16).

Early days in custody

- 5.8 The closed site reception area should be refurbished and well maintained. (1.14, repeated recommendation 1.42)
- 5.9 Category D prisoners should be transferred directly to the open site and the practice of accommodating them on the closed site and routine strip-searching should cease. (1.15)
- 5.10 Initial safety screening interviews should be conducted in private. (1.16)
- 5.11 Squat searches should only take place exceptionally when authorised by a manager on the basis of a risk assessment. (1.17)
- 5.12 First night cells should be clean and properly prepared for occupation. (1.18)
- 5.13 Night staff should speak to and know the location of all new prisoners and be aware of any specific needs they might have at both sites. (1.19)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.14 All cell sharing risk assessments should be reviewed regularly. (1.29)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.15 The gated cells in segregation should not be used solely to prevent self-harming. (1.36, repeated recommendation 3.47)
- 5.16 The prison should provide telephones so that prisoners can contact the Samaritans in private. (1.37)
- 5.17 ACCT reviews including those post-closure should take place on time and there should be appropriate multidisciplinary attendance. (1.38)

Security

- 5.18 Links between the security department and the violence reduction and drug strategy committees should be strengthened, attendance at meetings improved and data analysed more effectively. (1.52)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.19 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme should be linked to the sentence planning process, and should be used to challenge prisoners to achieve agreed targets. (1.57, repeated recommendation 7.43).
- 5.20 Decisions to demote prisoners to the basic level should be fair, based on patterns of behaviour and always justified; outcomes should be monitored to ensure this happens. (1.58)

Discipline

- 5.21 Detailed analyses of adjudications, use of force and segregation should take place and links to the safer custody committee strengthened. (1.70)

Residential units

- 5.22 Single cells should not be used for double occupancy. (2.8, repeated recommendation 2.21)
- 5.23 Dormitory accommodation on the open site should be refurbished and offer appropriate levels of privacy and space. (2.9)
- 5.24 The applications system should be monitored and quality assured by managers. (2.10)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.25 Wing file entries should provide evidence of staff engagement, including with sentence planning, and wing managers should carry out regular quality assurance checks of entries in wing history files. (2.17)

Equality and diversity

- 5.26 The prison should extend equality monitoring to include all protected characteristics. (2.24)
- 5.27 Discrimination incident reporting forms should be investigated within a reasonable timescale and prisoners informed of the outcome in writing. Effective quality assurance procedures should be put in place. (2.25)
- 5.28 Telephone interpreting services should be used for confidential prisoner matters including health care screenings and adjudications. (2.36)
- 5.29 A range of appropriate wing-based activities should be available for older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities. (2.37)
- 5.30 Personal emergency evacuation plans should be drawn up for those who need them and staff should be aware of those who require assistance. (2.38)

Complaints

- 5.31 All complaints should be properly investigated, and responses should be respectful and prompt. (2.48)

Health services

- 5.32 Patient access to a GP for a routine appointment should be within an acceptable waiting time of less than two weeks. (2.62)
- 5.33 Disabled patients should be able to access the health care centre. (2.63)

- 5.34 Risk assessments for all patients receiving their medication in possession should be included on SystemOne. (2.77)
- 5.35 All areas where medication is administered should be secured by a double-gated system. (2.78)
- 5.36 All medicines should be administered from their original packaging or from that labelled for a specific patient in accordance with current regulations. (2.79)
- 5.37 Secure lockable medicines storage facilities should be provided for all prisoners who receive their medication in possession. (2.80)
- 5.38 Pharmacy-led clinics and medicine use reviews should be introduced. (2.81)
- 5.39 Day care services should be available for prisoners who need additional therapeutic support for emotional, behavioural and mental health problems. (2.90)
- 5.40 Prisoners should have access to professional counselling services. (2.91)
- 5.41 Mental health awareness training should be delivered to all prison staff. (2.92)

Catering

- 5.42 There should be facilities to allow prisoners to eat their meals out of their cells on the closed site. (2.97)
- 5.43 Prisoners in the open site annexes should have opportunities to cook for themselves. (2.98)

Purchases

- 5.44 Fresh fruit should be available through the prison shop. (2.104, repeated recommendation 8.16)
- 5.45 New prisoners should have access to a full canteen order after arrival at the prison. (2.105)

Time out of cell

- 5.46 All prisoners should be given an hour's exercise outside each day. (3.4, repeated recommendation 6.63)
- 5.47 The core day should be adhered to and regime activities maximised, including for those beyond retirement age, to ensure the minimum number of prisoners are left locked up during the working day. (3.5)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.48 The number of vocational qualifications should be increased at both sites, either separately and/or through training in prison work, to prepare prisoners for further training on release or employment. (3.15)

- 5.49 The learning and skills and work provision for vulnerable prisoners should be sufficient to meet their individual learning needs in preparation for further training and/or employment. (3.16)
- 5.50 Punctuality and attendance at education classes should be improved by more efficient action by prison staff to ensure prisoners attend classes. (3.27)
- 5.51 The new systems for recognising and recording non-accredited skills gained by prisoners in prison work areas and working out should be fully implemented. (3.28, repeated recommendation 6.34)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.52 The PE provision should undergo a review to ensure staffing is being used efficiently and effectively and that it is better meeting the needs of the population and supporting prisoners in preparing for employment in the fitness industry. (3.37)
- 5.53 Vulnerable prisoners should have access to the same number of PE sessions as other prisoners (3.38, repeated recommendation 6.49)
- 5.54 The internal deterioration of the PE building on the open site should be improved. (3.39)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.55 More opportunities should be developed for prisoners to access ROTL for college and employment purposes. (4.4)

Offender management and planning

- 5.56 All eligible prisoners should have a sentence plan and OASYS assessments should be completed on time. (4.13)
- 5.57 There should be ongoing recorded contact with all prisoners to oversee the achievement of sentence plans and resettlement targets. (4.14)

Reintegration planning

- 5.58 The mandatory employability courses should be reviewed to provide better preparation for community service work and progression to training or paid employment. (4.31)
- 5.59 A formal action plan to address the gaps in provision identified within the drug and alcohol needs analysis should be developed and there should be a formal progress review process within the monthly drug strategy meeting. (4.37)
- 5.60 Visits should start at the advertised time. (4.45, repeated recommendation 9.109)
- 5.61 Closed visits should be authorised only when there is significant risk justified by security intelligence. (4.46, repeated recommendation 9.110)
- 5.62 Visitors should be able to book their next visit while they are at the establishment (4.47, repeated recommendation 9.106)

- 5.63 The range of interventions available should be broadened to meet the needs of the prison population. (4.52)

Housekeeping points

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.64 The prison should explore the possibility of reinstating prisoner Insiders at local courts. (1.7)

Early days in custody

- 5.65 Prisoners arriving in the evening should have access to a hot meal. (1.20)
- 5.66 Key information for prisoners should be displayed in holding rooms. (1.21)
- 5.67 Remand prisoners should be able to receive clothing through the post or during visits for an initial period following first reception. (1.22)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.68 Managers should investigate the negative views of victimisation by staff at the closed site and take any appropriate action to address problems. (1.30)
- 5.69 Attendance at the monthly safer custody meetings should be improved and monitored. (1.31)

Safeguarding

- 5.70 The local adult safeguarding policy should be rolled out across the prison. (1.42)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.71 Applications to be promoted to the enhanced level should be processed quickly and reviews should be timely. (1.59)

Discipline

- 5.72 Attendance at standardisation meetings should be improved. (1.63)

Residential units

- 5.73 The offensive displays policy should be enforced. (2.11)
- 5.74 Telephones should be adequately screened to ensure privacy. (2.12)

Equality and diversity

- 5.75 The role of diversity and race equality officers should be clarified, and specific training provided. (2.26)
- 5.76 Equality impact assessments should be completed according to the advertised programme. (2.27)
- 5.77 Prisoners should not have to contribute financially to attend celebratory events. (2.28)
- 5.78 Information about the prison regime should be available to foreign national prisoners in a language they understand. (2.39)

Complaints

- 5.79 Complaint forms and confidential access envelopes should be readily available beside complaints boxes. (2.49)
- 5.80 Local guidance should be put in place outlining protection measures for prisoners who have submitted complaints against staff. (2.50)

Health services

- 5.81 Prisoners should have access to a dedicated health care forum. (2.64)
- 5.82 All clinical areas should be cleaned to a standard to comply with infection control. (2.65)
- 5.83 Recording checks of resuscitation equipment should be consistent. (2.66)
- 5.84 Information about health care services should be widely available throughout the prison. (2.67)
- 5.85 Fridge temperatures should be recorded daily and explanations provided when these are outside the specified guidelines. (2.82)
- 5.86 All medicines should be stored to comply with regulations. (2.83)
- 5.87 All rooms used for medicines storage and administration should be fit for purpose and clean and all medicines should be stored in conditions compliant with their product licence. (2.84)
- 5.88 The main receiving block for controlled drugs should have a legally compliant controlled drugs register. (2.85)
- 5.89 Procedures should be put in place to ensure vulnerable prisoners receive appropriate privacy and confidentiality when receiving their medication. (2.86)

Catering

- 5.90 Conditions in the dining room at the closed site should be improved. (2.99)

Purchases

- 5.91 The negative perception of the range of goods available should be explored. (2.106)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.92 National definitions of literacy and numeracy levels and what these mean for adults should be circulated to all prison staff to help them understand the impact of prisoners' literacy and numeracy initial assessment scores. (3.23)

Offender management and planning

- 5.93 Sentence planning meetings should be fully minuted. (4.15)
- 5.94 Offender supervisors should receive formalised professional supervision and feedback. (4.16)

Reintegration planning

- 5.95 The condition of furniture in the visits hall at the closed site should be improved. (4.48)

Examples of good practice

- 5.96 The excellent use of prisoner Insiders during first night processes and the 'first time in prison' meeting provided new prisoners with a reassuring and informative welcome. (1.23)
- 5.97 The restorative justice interventions were innovative and effective. (4.53)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief Inspector
Sean Sullivan	Team leader
Rosemarie Bugdale	Inspector
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Rachel Murray	Research officer
Nalini Sharma	Research officer
Annie Crowley	Research officer
Amy Radford	Research trainee

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Mick Bowen	Health services inspector
Majella Pearce	Health services inspector
Deborah Hylands	Pharmacist
Keith Williamson	Care Quality Commission inspector
Nigel Bragg	Ofsted inspector
Charles Clark	Ofsted inspector
Julia Horsman	Ofsted inspector
Stephen Miller	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.

Safety	
Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.	
At the last inspection, in 2009, reception, first night and induction procedures were generally satisfactory, although significant elements needed further development. The prison was subject to significant pressure because of the throughput of prisoners due to regular overcrowding drafts. Violence reduction procedures were generally good, with some aspects very good. Suicide and self-harm prevention work was satisfactory, but there were concerns about access to Listeners at night. Prisoners in the closed part of the prison, including vulnerable prisoners, said they felt safe, but prisoners on the open site, house block 8, raised concerns about their safety. Security and rules were applied proportionately, although the application of rules on house block 8 was confused. Segregation was well managed. The use of force was not excessive. Drug detoxification and maintenance procedures required further development, but drug use was comparatively low. The prison was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test.	
Main recommendations	
There should be ongoing monitoring and review of the revised first night arrangements on house blocks 1-6 to ensure that they become fully established and effective. (HP51)	Partially achieved
Prisoners should have access to Listeners at any time of the day or night. (HP52)	Achieved
Recommendations	
Escort vehicles should be clean and free from graffiti. (1.12)	Achieved
Prisoners should be held in court cells for the minimum period possible. (1.13) (To NOMS)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 1.5)
Prisoners should be held in cellular vehicles for the minimum period possible. (1.14)	Achieved
Prisoners received on overcrowding drafts should not be subsequently transferred further away from home. (1.15)	No longer relevant
Prisoners should receive 24 hours' notice of planned transfers. (1.16)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 1.6)
The house blocks 1-6 reception area should be refurbished and well maintained. (1.42)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 1.14)

Prisoners should not be held for long periods in reception. (1.43)	Partially achieved
All staff should be made aware of the location and special needs of all new arrivals. (1.44)	Achieved
The need for all prisoners transferring to house block 8 to first spend the night on house block 6 should be reviewed. (1.45)	Not achieved
The prison should ensure that prisoners transferring to house block 8 are told in advance that they will be located in dormitory accommodation. (1.46)	Achieved
The house block 8 induction programme should be revised at the earliest opportunity. (1.47)	Not achieved
Monitoring entries in tackling antisocial behaviour (TAB) documents should provide evidence of engagement by staff. (3.18)	Not achieved
Managers should investigate the negative views on safety expressed in our survey by black and minority ethnic respondents in house blocks 1 to 7 and all respondents on house block 8. Their findings should be used proactively to improve perceptions. (3.19)	Partially achieved
There should be a written policy document outlining arrangements for dealing with vulnerable prisoners. (3.26)	Achieved
The number of work and activity places for vulnerable prisoners should be increased to meet demand. (3.27)	Not achieved
The suicide and self-harm policy document should be revised to reflect accurately the service and safeguards available. (3.43)	Achieved
There should be multidisciplinary attendance at case reviews where necessary. (3.44)	Not achieved
Samaritans telephones should be provided in all residential areas of house blocks 1 to 7. (3.45)	Not achieved
All staff should carry personal-issue anti-ligature knives attached to their person. (3.46)	Achieved
The gated cells in segregation should not be used solely to prevent self-harming. (3.47)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 1.36)
Managers should review the quality of monitoring entries in assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents and satisfy themselves that there has been consistent staff engagement. (3.48)	Not achieved
Staff representatives from house block 8 should attend security committee meetings regularly. (7.9)	Not achieved
Rules and routines should be widely publicised on house block 8 and their application should be consistent. (7.10)	Achieved

Group or collective punishments should not be used. (7.31)	Achieved
Written statements from staff in use of force documentation should show evidence of the use of de-escalation. (7.32)	Achieved
Managers should ensure that written entries in segregation unit prisoner files improve. (7.33)	Not achieved
There should be formal planning to return prisoners held in the segregation unit under good order or discipline to normal prison location. (7.34)	Partially achieved
Clinical services should be extended to offer a more flexible prescribing regime, incorporating stabilisation, detoxification and maintenance provision of methadone. (3.90)	Achieved
Prescribing regimes for substance-dependent prisoners, whether on remand or sentenced, should be based on individual need and adhere to national guidance. (3.91)	Achieved
Target testing should be monitored more effectively to ensure it is undertaken within the required timeframe. (3.92)	Not achieved
The protocols and procedures for drug and alcohol testing prisoners in house block 8 should be clarified and publicised to ensure a fair and transparent regime that is compliant with relevant Prison Service Orders. (3.93)	Not achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2009, the quality of accommodation varied greatly across the three sites. It was reasonable on house blocks 1-6, although many toilets were inadequately screened and the outside areas were dirty. We still had concerns about night sanitation arrangements on house block 7, and the accommodation on house block 8 was poor. Staff-prisoner relationships were generally good in the closed prison, being very good on house block 7, but prisoners on house block 8 were very negative about staff. Prisoner experience of the personal officer scheme was similarly varied. Despite some negative perceptions in our survey, race equality, disability and foreign national services were appropriate, and outcomes for prisoners reasonably good. Other aspects of diversity were less well developed. We received many complaints about the food on house blocks 1-6, although the quality was better on 7 and 8. Access to applications and complaints was satisfactory, but prisoners expressed limited confidence in procedures. Many replies to complaints failed to address the issues. The quality of healthcare was generally good, but access to services on house blocks 1- 6 took too long. Inpatient facilities were well managed. The closed part of the prison was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test, but that house block 8, the open prison, was not performing sufficiently well.

Main recommendations

Cell accommodation should be fit for purpose and should include integral sanitation and better quality dormitory accommodation on house block 8. (HP53)

Not achieved

There should be monitoring to assess the impact of prisoners' religion, disability and/or foreign national status on their participation in the prison's regime. (HP54)	Not achieved
There should be equality of access to health care provision across the prison. (HP55)	Partially achieved
Recommendations	
Single cells should not be used for double occupancy. (2.21)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 2.8)
Staff should answer all cell call bells within five minutes. (2.22)	Achieved
There should be better standards of cleanliness in communal areas in house block 8. (2.23)	Not achieved
All prisoners in dormitories in house block 8 should be issued with courtesy keys. (2.24)	Not achieved
Conditions in dormitories on house block 8 should be improved to allow adequate privacy, and there should be sufficient furniture for prisoners to hang up their clothes. (2.25)	Not achieved
Electrical sockets should be fitted by each bed space in house block 8 to allow prisoners to listen to music or watch their own television with headphones. (2.26)	Not achieved
All prisoners should have a lockable locker to secure their personal possessions. (2.27)	Not achieved
Prisoners' incoming mail should be distributed on the day it arrives. (2.28)	Achieved
Prisoners should be able to access their stored property within one week of an application. (2.29)	Not achieved
Communal shower rooms should be cleaned sufficiently, and the flaking paint should be dealt with. (2.30)	Not achieved
The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme should be linked to the sentence planning process, and should be used to challenge prisoners to achieve agreed targets. (7.43)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 1.57)
There should be a specific strategy to address and improve the quality of staff-prisoner relationships on house block 8. (2.35)	Achieved
An effective personal officer scheme should be introduced on house block 8. (2.40)	Achieved
Wing file entries should provide evidence of engagement by staff. (2.41)	Not achieved
Wing managers should carry out regular quality assurance checks of entries in wing history files. (2.42)	Not achieved

There should be better links between personal officers and offender supervisors. (2.43)	Not achieved
Breakfast should be served on the morning it is to be eaten. (8.7)	Not achieved
Lunch should not be served before noon and dinner before 5pm. (8.8)	Achieved
Fresh fruit should be available through the prison shop. (8.16)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 2.104)
Prisoners should be able to buy items from the prison shop within 24 hours of arrival. (8.17)	Not achieved
The establishment should improve the service offered to prisoners through the catalogue system. (8.18)	Partially achieved
Each strand of diversity should be covered by an up-to-date policy and related action plan. (4.8)	Achieved
The role of diversity and race equality officers and prisoner wing representatives should be clarified and specific training provided. (4.9)	Partially achieved
There should be equality impact assessments for all areas of diversity. (4.10)	Partially achieved
The prison should develop and implement a programme as soon as possible to challenge racist and discriminatory prisoner behaviour. (4.21)	Achieved
The prison should investigate the reasons why Muslim prisoners hold more negative views of the regime than non-Muslims. (4.25)	Achieved
Information for foreign national prisoners about the regime at Hewell should be available to them in a language they understand. (4.36)	Not achieved
The specific needs of all foreign national new arrivals should be identified, and this information should be used to develop a needs analysis and appropriate services to meet these needs. (4.37)	Achieved
Foreign national prisoners should be able to have free airmail letters, where appropriate. (4.38)	Achieved
The role of foreign national officer representatives should be clarified and specific training made available. (4.39)	Achieved
Foreign national prisoner representatives should be identified, and they should also attend the monthly foreign national advisory group. (4.40)	Achieved
A quality assurance scheme should be introduced to ensure that the individual needs of prisoners with disabilities are met. (4.52)	Achieved
The prison should identify representatives of prisoners with disabilities and develop a forum for these prisoners. (4.53)	Achieved
The older prisoner policy should be fully implemented. (4.57)	Achieved

A range of age-appropriate wing-based activities should be available for older prisoners no longer working. (4.58)	Not achieved
The prison should identify a lead officer for work with gay and bisexual prisoners, there should be an assessment of their number and needs, and information displayed about sources of support and help. (4.61)	Achieved
Complaint boxes should only be opened by staff responsible for processing complaints. (3.60)	Partially achieved
Complaints forwarded to a third party should be actively followed up to ensure a complete response is received within the required timescale. (3.61)	Partially achieved
Complaint forms should not be returned to prisoners unanswered because of technical reasons. (3.62)	No longer relevant
Legal and domestic visits should not clash. (3.69).	Achieved
The prison should explore further why prisoners sometimes found it difficult to obtain bail information. (3.70).	Achieved
Representatives from the chaplaincy should always be invited to attend prisoners ACCT reviews. (3.77)	Achieved
There should be better waiting facilities for vulnerable prisoners attending health care appointments. (5.69)	Achieved
The dispensary and treatment room in upper medical should be refurbished and made fit for purpose. (5.70)	Achieved
There should be proper arrangements for the removal of hazardous waste from health care, including both dental surgeries. Nursing staff should not be required to remove clinical waste to external storage sites. (5.71)	Partially achieved
There should be a programme of daily cleaning to all health care areas, including those on house blocks 7 and 8, and this should be monitored by senior staff. (5.72)	Achieved
The treatment room on house block 2 should be closed immediately and an alternative site identified to administer medicines. (5.73)	Achieved
Proper hand washing facilities should be installed in all health care areas, including patient waiting areas. (5.74)	Achieved
Pharmacy support should include pharmacy technicians, who should be responsible for the administration of in-possession medication to all prisoners. (5.75)	Partially achieved
The inpatient unit should provide storage facilities for patients' clothing and other items. (5.76)	Achieved
The inpatient bathroom, staff toilets and laundry rooms should be refurbished to provide a clean and acceptable environment. (5.77)	Not achieved

The inpatient treatment room should be refurbished to include proper hand washing facilities, lighting for clinical work and pharmaceutical storage. (5.78)	Achieved
A stair lift should be provided between upper and lower medical. (5.79)	Not achieved
There should be a dedicated patient health care forum chaired by a senior nurse to address prisoners' concerns about health care, and to inform patients of changes in health services. (5.80)	Not achieved
Night sedation should not be given to patients before 9pm. (5.81)	Achieved
The head of health care should review night-time and weekend staffing levels to ensure that appropriate care, including medicine administration, is available to all prisoners. (5.82)	Achieved
Health promotion should be improved and should cover all aspects of health and wellbeing. (5.83)	Partially achieved
The head of health care should introduce wing-based nursing. (5.84)	Achieved
Formal documented triage algorithms should be used to ensure consistency and continuity of care and advice. (5.85)	Achieved
Nurses trained in health assessment should be used for such assessments to reduce GP waiting times. (5.86)	Achieved
There should be a regular maintenance programme for all health equipment. (5.87)	Achieved
Controlled drugs should be stored safely. (5.88)	Partially achieved
Requisitions for controlled drugs should be ordered by a doctor. (5.89)	Achieved
The transfer of methadone from upper medical to house block 6 should be monitored to check that the house block receives the quantity ordered. (5.90)	Achieved
There should be a review of the simple medicines policy and the patient group directives to assess the medicines required, and appropriate staff should be fully trained in the procedures. (5.91)	Achieved
Faxed prescriptions should be subject to audit, and the pharmacist should check a random selection of dispensed faxes against the original prescription. (5.92)	Achieved
The in-possession risk assessments of each drug and patient should be documented and the reasons for the determination recorded. (5.93)	Partially achieved
The pharmacist should develop pharmacy-led clinics for prisoners. (5.94)	Not achieved
The medicines and therapeutics committee should ensure that prescribing data is used to demonstrate value for money and to promote effective medicines management. (5.95)	Achieved

The medicines and therapeutics committee should review the use of general stock, and named-patient medication should be used where possible. (5.96)	Achieved
The pharmacist should make regular date checks of all medicines held in the prison. (5.97)	Achieved
Agreed stock levels should be introduced, and the use of stock against medication prescribed should be audited. (5.98)	Achieved
The dental surgery in upper medical should be refurbished, including the installation of a washer/disinfector. (5.99)	Achieved
There should be dental hygienist/therapist sessions in upper medical. (5.100)	Partially achieved
Dental cover should be provided during periods of sickness and annual leave. (5.101)	Achieved
Dental staff or appropriately trained general nurses should provide dental triage. (5.102)	Achieved
A full range of NHS dental treatments should be available. (5.103)	Achieved
The dental service should include oral health promotion sessions. (5.104)	Achieved
A senior manager should be appointed to the inpatient unit, and a regular cohort of nursing staff should be deployed to the unit. (5.105)	Achieved
There should be administrative support for the inpatient unit. (5.106)	Achieved
Mental health teams should have a permanent base in the health care department. (5.107)	Achieved
There should be day care facilities to improve care for inpatients and prisoners less able to cope with life on the wings. (5.108)	Partially achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2009, Learning and skills provision was good. The prison had a clear strategic vision and development plans for learning and skills, although there had been delays in implementation. There was broadly sufficient activity to meet demand, with near full employment on house blocks 7 and 8. The range of work and accredited learning on house blocks 1-6 was good for a local prison, but there was too little accredited provision on house block 7. Regime and activity on house block 8 were particularly good and innovative. PE and library facilities were good. Access to time out of cell and association was reasonable in the closed part of the prison, and prisoners benefited from an open regime on house block 8. House blocks 1 to 7 were performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test, and house block 8 was performing well.

Main recommendations	
The quality of education classes should be improved across the prison. (HP56)	Achieved
The range and amount of vocational training and education provision on house block 7 should be increased. (HP57)	No longer relevant
Recommendations	
The prison should ensure the delivery of the core day as published. (6.61)	Not achieved
Prisoners beyond the age of retirement should not be locked up during the day. (6.62)	Not achieved
All prisoners should be given an hour's exercise outside. (6.63)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 3.4)
Benches and other equipment should be provided in exercise yards. (6.64)	Not achieved
Prisoners on house block 8 should be allowed to exercise during association. (6.65)	Achieved
There should be better use of data to inform learning and skills monitoring and decision making (6.29)	Achieved
The planned learning and skills improvements delayed by the merger should be implemented (6.30)	Achieved
There should be improved arrangements and accommodation for individual prisoner induction interviews on house blocks 1-6 (6.31)	Achieved
The information for prisoners on house block 8 about arrangements for working out should be improved. (6.32)	Achieved
There should be improved achievements of functional skills in communications, entry literacy and level two numeracy qualifications. (6.33)	Achieved
The new systems for recognising and recording non-accredited skills gained by prisoners in prison work areas and working-out should be fully implemented. (6.34)	Partially achieved (Rec repeated, 3.28)
There should be clear individual target setting and action planning for prisoners on education programmes. (6.35)	Achieved
There should be better punctuality and start times for afternoon education sessions in house blocks 1-6 (6.36)	Not achieved
The resources and accommodation used for the English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) screening during the induction process on house blocks 1-6 should be improved. (6.37)	Achieved

The opening times of the libraries in house blocks 1-6 and 7 should be extended and all prisoners should be given regular access to a library (6.38)	Achieved
The plans to move the house block 8 library to the ground floor should be implemented to provide better service to prepare prisoners for resettlement. (6.39)	Achieved
All the libraries should have more books relating to vocational skills and employment. (6.40)	Achieved
The library service should be better coordinated across the prison and there should be better promotion of library use. (6.41)	Achieved
The PE accredited courses that lead to employment should be offered more frequently (6.48)	Not achieved
Vulnerable prisoners should have access to the same number of PE sessions as other prisoners. (6.49)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 3.38)
The gym showers on the house block 8 should be screened from the corridor. (6.50)	Achieved
The heating in the house block 7 gym should be repaired. (6.51)	No longer relevant
Clean PE kit should be provided at each session for prisoner on house block 7. (6.52)	No longer relevant

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 2009, The management of resettlement was good, with meaningful action plans across the pathways. Links with the voluntary and community sectors were well managed. Offender management required improved coordination, including better integration of the probation team. The quality of offender supervision also needed development. Short-sentenced prisoners received assistance, and there were helpful structures for all prisoners before their discharge. Most pathways were well developed, with clear leadership and innovation in some areas. Outcomes across the pathways were significant. The prison was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

There should be a strategy for offender management. (9.38)	Achieved
There should be more use of probation staff's specific skills in public protection, and they should be integrated into the offender management unit (OMU). (9.39)	Achieved
The quality of sentence plan targets and the recording of contact with prisoners should be improved. (9.40)	Achieved

Offender managers should attend and actively participate in sentence planning meetings, monitor and manage the implementation of objectives, and maintain sufficient contact with prisoners. (9.41)	Partially achieved
CARAT and programme staff should attend relevant sentence planning meetings. (9.42)	Partially achieved
OASys (offender assessment system) should be the main assessment and planning document, and should be reviewed and actively used by staff. (9.43)	Achieved
Attendance at public protection strategy meetings should be improved. (9.44)	Achieved
There should be arrangements to monitor the telephone calls of prisoners who speak foreign languages. (9.45)	Achieved
The process of carrying out a risk assessment on all prisoners with current or previous multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) offences should be reviewed. (9.46)	Achieved
Lifer prisoners should be held in prisons appropriate to their security categorisation. (9.47) (To NOMS)	Achieved
There should be better arrangements on HB 8 to coordinate and accommodate resources to support prisoners preparing for education, training and employment on release. (9.68)	Achieved
There should be adequate classroom accommodation on house block 7 for group work programmes. (9.84)	No longer relevant
There should be sufficient voluntary drug testing compacts available to meet demand. (9.85)	No longer relevant
Visitors should be able to book their next visit while they are at the establishment. (9.106)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 4.47)
Prisoners transferred to house blocks 1-6 should be entitled to a reception visit and should be able to use all valid visiting orders from their previous establishment. (9.107)	Achieved
Prisoners should be able to exchange unused visiting orders for additional PIN credit. (9.108)	Not achieved
Visits should start at the advertised time. (9.109)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 4.45)
Closed visits should be authorised only when there is significant risk justified by security intelligence. (9.110)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 4.46)
Non-contact tables should not be used for reception visits. (9.111)	Achieved
Prisoners should not have to wear a bib in the visits room. (9.112)	Not achieved

A staffed play area should be provided on house block 8. (9.113).	Achieved
All prisoners should be able to participate in family time visits, irrespective of their IEP status. (9.114)	Achieved
The prison should ensure there is flexibility in programme delivery to meet prisoner needs across the three sites. (9.126)	Achieved

Appendix III: Prison population profile

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

Population breakdown by:

Status	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	2	801	63.7
Recall	0	106	8.4
Convicted unsentenced	0	109	8.6
Remand	0	234	18.6
Civil prisoners	0	2	0.2
Detainees	0	7	0.6
Total	2	1,259	100

Sentence	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	0	355	28.2
Less than 6 months	0	139	11.0
6 months to less than 12 months	0	96	7.6
12 months to less than 2 years	0	172	13.6
2 years to less than 4 years	1	174	21.8
4 years to less than 10 years	0	215	17.0
10 years and over (not life)	0	33	2.6
ISPP		51	
Life	1	24	6.0
Total	2	1,259	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Minimum Age: 19	-	-
Under 21 years	2	0.2
21 years to 29 years	550	43.6
30 years to 39 years	408	32.4
40 years to 49 years	212	16.8
50 years to 59 years	65	5.2
60 years to 69 years	17	1.3
70 plus years	7	0.6
Maximum Age: 94	-	-
Total	1,261	100

Nationality	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	1	1,069	84.9
Foreign nationals	1	179	14.3
Not stated	0	11	0.9
Total	2	1,259	100

Security category	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	0	32	2.5
Uncategorised sentenced	0	372	28.9
Cat A			
Cat B	1	55	4.4
Cat C	1	581	46.2
Cat D	0	218	17.3

Other Open YOI			
Total	2	1,259	100

Ethnicity	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White	0	910	72.2
British	0	830	65.8
Irish	0	5	0.4
Other white	0	75	6.0
Mixed	0	44	3.5
White and black Caribbean	0	31	2.5
White and black African	0	2	0.2
White and Asian	0	6	0.5
Other mixed	0	5	0.4
Asian or Asian British	0	122	9.7
Indian	0	52	4.1
Pakistani	0	27	2.1
Bangladeshi	0	3	0.2
Other Asian	0	39	3.1
Black or black British	1	118	9.4
Caribbean	1	71	5.7
African	0	27	2.1
Other black	0	20	1.6
Chinese or other ethnic group	1	14	1.2
Chinese	0	1	0.1
Arab	0	5	0.4
Other ethnic group	1	8	0.7
Not stated	0	51	4.0
Total	2	1,259	100

Religion	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist		2	0.2
Church of England		258	20.5
Roman Catholic		177	14.0
Other Christian denominations		131	10.4
Muslim	1	120	9.6
Sikh		4	2.9
Hindu		4	0.3
Buddhist	1	36	2.9
Jewish		1	0.1
Other		6	0.5
No religion		488	38.7
Total	2	1,259	100

Other demographics	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Gypsy/Romany/ traveller	0	5	0.4
Total	0	5	0.4

Other demographics	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)	0	16	1.3
Total	0	16	1.3

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	1	0.1	229	18.2
1 month to 3 months	1	0.1	280	22.2
3 months to 6 months	0	0.0	209	16.6
6 months to 1 year	0	0.0	117	9.3
1 year to 2 years	0	0.0	45	3.6
2 years to 4 years	0	0.0	24	1.9
4 years or more	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	2	0.2	904	71.8

Sentenced prisoners only

	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	0	13	1.0
Public protection cases	0	268	21.3
Total	0	281	22.3

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0.0	129	36.3
1 month to 3 months	0	0.0	114	32.1
3 months to 6 months	0	0.0	70	19.7
6 months to 1 year	0	0.0	35	9.9
1 year to 2 years	0	0.0	5	1.4
2 years to 4 years	0	0.0	2	0.6
4 years or more	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	0	0.0	355	28.2

Main offence	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	2	245	19.7
Sexual offences	0	83	6.6
Burglary	0	125	9.9
Robbery	0	78	6.2
Theft and handling	0	145	11.5
Fraud and forgery	0	45	3.6
Drugs offences	0	160	12.7
Other offences	0	367	29.2
Civil offences	0	1	0.1
Offence not recorded / holding warrant	0	6	0.5
Total	2	1,259	100

Appendix IVa: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews (closed site)

Prisoner survey methodology

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

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 30 October 2012 the prisoner population at HMP Hewell was 1039. The sample size was 218. Overall, this represented 21% of the prisoner population.

Selecting the sample

Respondents were randomly selected from a P-Nomis prisoner 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. No respondents refused to complete a questionnaire.

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. No respondents required an interviewer.

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:

- to have their questionnaire ready to hand back to a member of the research team at a specified time;
- to seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable; or
- to 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, 182 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 18% of the prison population. The response rate was 84%. In total, 26 questionnaires were not returned and 10 were returned blank.

Comparisons

The following details the results from the survey. Data from each establishment has 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 2012 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 34 local prisons since April 2007.
- The current survey responses in 2011 against the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Hewell in 2012.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between those who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2011 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of prisoners 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, ie. 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 prisoners' background details.

It should be noted that, in order for statistical comparisons to be made between the most recent survey data and that 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 as well as examples of comments made by prisoners. 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 to 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 is excluded). The actual numbers will match up as the data is cleaned to be consistent.

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

Survey summary

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	86	(48%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	52	(29%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	34	(19%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	3	(2%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	3	(2%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	2	(1%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>	106	(61%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	18	(10%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	26	(15%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	24	(14%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	1	(1%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Not sentenced	51	(29%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	33	(19%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	13	(7%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	25	(14%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	27	(15%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	15	(8%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	4	(2%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	6	(3%)
	<i>Life</i>	3	(2%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)		
	<i>Yes</i>	23	(13%)
	<i>No</i>	156	(87%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	175	(97%)
	<i>No</i>	6	(3%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	173	(96%)
	<i>No</i>	7	(4%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish)</i>	121	(67%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	4	(2%)
	<i>White - other</i>	9	(5%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	7	(4%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	4	(2%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	2	(1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	4	(2%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i>	5	(3%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i>	9	(5%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Mixed race - other</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Arab</i>	2	(1%)

Asian or Asian British - Pakistani 9 (5%) Other ethnic group..... 2 (1%)
 Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi 1 (1%)

Q1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?
 Yes 8 (5%)
 No..... 169 (95%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

None	48 (27%)	Hindu.....	0 (0%)
Church of England.....	50 (28%)	Jewish.....	0 (0%)
Catholic.....	44 (25%)	Muslim	17 (9%)
Protestant.....	1 (1%)	Sikh	3 (2%)
Other Christian denomination.....	7 (4%)	Other.....	4 (2%)
Buddhist	5 (3%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

Heterosexual/straight	179 (99%)
Homosexual/gay	1 (1%)
Bisexual.....	1 (1%)

Q1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)?

Yes	33 (18%)
No.....	146 (82%)

Q1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?

Yes	13 (7%)
No.....	165 (93%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes	67 (37%)
No.....	115 (63%)

Q1.15 Do you have children under the age of 18?

Yes	100 (55%)
No.....	81 (45%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1 On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?

Less than 2 hours	131 (73%)
2 hours or longer.....	41 (23%)
Don't remember	7 (4%)

Q2.2 On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?

My journey was less than two hours.....	131 (73%)
Yes.....	19 (11%)
No.....	27 (15%)
Don't remember	2 (1%)

Q2.3 On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?

My journey was less than two hours.....	131 (73%)
Yes.....	4 (2%)
No.....	44 (24%)

	<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (1%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes	105 (59%)
	No.....	63 (35%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	11 (6%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes.....	130 (73%)
	No.....	43 (24%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	5 (3%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	<i>Very well</i>	34 (19%)
	<i>Well</i>	89 (49%)
	<i>Neither</i>	39 (22%)
	<i>Badly</i>	8 (4%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	8 (4%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (2%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Yes, someone told me</i>	108 (59%)
	<i>Yes, I received written information</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>No, I was not told anything</i>	56 (31%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (3%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes.....	146 (82%)
	No.....	26 (15%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (4%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	61 (34%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	101 (56%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	18 (10%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes.....	125 (69%)
	No	48 (27%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (4%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	<i>Very well</i>	16 (9%)
	<i>Well</i>	88 (49%)
	<i>Neither</i>	44 (24%)
	<i>Badly</i>	18 (10%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	11 (6%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (2%)

- Q3.4 Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | | | |
|--|----------|--|----------|
| <i>Loss of property</i> | 23 (13%) | <i>Physical health</i> | 31 (18%) |
| <i>Housing problems</i> | 36 (20%) | <i>Mental health</i> | 38 (22%) |
| <i>Contacting employers</i> | 7 (4%) | <i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i> | 10 (6%) |
| <i>Contacting family</i> | 54 (31%) | <i>Getting phone numbers</i> | 56 (32%) |
| <i>Childcare</i> | 6 (3%) | <i>Other</i> | 4 (2%) |
| <i>Money worries</i> | 48 (27%) | Did not have any problems | 46 (26%) |
| <i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i> | 35 (20%) | | |
- Q3.5 Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| Yes | 41 (24%) |
| No..... | 85 (49%) |
| Did not have any problems | 46 (27%) |
- Q3.6 When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <i>Tobacco</i> | 157 (88%) |
| <i>A shower</i> | 28 (16%) |
| <i>A free telephone call</i> | 139 (78%) |
| <i>Something to eat</i> | 120 (67%) |
| <i>PIN phone credit</i> | 113 (63%) |
| <i>Toiletries/basic items</i> | 84 (47%) |
| Did not receive anything | 4 (2%) |
- Q3.7 When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|--|-----------|
| <i>Chaplain</i> | 86 (49%) |
| <i>Someone from health services</i> | 120 (68%) |
| <i>A Listener/Samaritans</i> | 98 (55%) |
| <i>Prison shop/canteen</i> | 24 (14%) |
| Did not have access to any of these | 27 (15%) |
- Q3.8 When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| <i>What was going to happen to you</i> | 73 (43%) |
| <i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i> | 70 (41%) |
| <i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i> | 64 (38%) |
| <i>Your entitlement to visits</i> | 65 (38%) |
| <i>Health services</i> | 80 (47%) |
| <i>Chaplaincy</i> | 68 (40%) |
| Not offered any information | 47 (28%) |
- Q3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?**
- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Yes | 134 (76%) |
| No..... | 30 (17%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 12 (7%) |
- Q3.10 How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?**
- | | |
|---|-----------|
| Have not been on an induction course | 47 (27%) |
| <i>Within the first week</i> | 104 (59%) |
| <i>More than a week</i> | 18 (10%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 8 (5%) |

Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	47 (27%)
	Yes.....	62 (36%)
	No.....	53 (31%)
	Don't remember.....	11 (6%)

Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	54 (31%)
	Within the first week.....	65 (37%)
	More than a week.....	41 (23%)
	Don't remember.....	17 (10%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to:					
		Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult
						N/A
	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	17 (10%)	50 (29%)	21 (12%)	34 (20%)	24 (14%)
	Attend legal visits?	21 (13%)	77 (48%)	10 (6%)	14 (9%)	11 (7%)
	Get bail information?	8 (5%)	23 (16%)	26 (18%)	21 (14%)	22 (15%)
						47 (32%)

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>	27 (16%)
	Yes.....	73 (42%)
	No.....	74 (43%)

Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	
	Yes.....	80 (45%)
	No.....	12 (7%)
	Don't know.....	84 (48%)

Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	80 (45%)	93 (53%)	3 (2%)
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	155 (88%)	20 (11%)	1 (1%)
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	128 (73%)	42 (24%)	6 (3%)
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	77 (44%)	89 (51%)	9 (5%)
	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	41 (23%)	119 (68%)	15 (9%)
	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	120 (70%)	49 (28%)	3 (2%)
	If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	30 (17%)	90 (52%)	54 (31%)

Q4.5	What is the food like here?		
	Very good.....	7 (4%)	
	Good.....	30 (17%)	
	Neither.....	44 (25%)	
	Bad.....	51 (29%)	
	Very bad.....	43 (25%)	
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?		
	Have not bought anything yet/don't know	14 (8%)	
	Yes.....	87 (50%)	
	No.....	74 (42%)	
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?		
	Yes.....	113 (63%)	
	No.....	12 (7%)	
	Don't know.....	53 (30%)	
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?		
	Yes.....	80 (46%)	
	No.....	27 (16%)	
	Don't know/N/A.....	67 (39%)	
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?		
	Yes.....	109 (61%)	
	No.....	15 (8%)	
	Don't know/N/A.....	55 (31%)	
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?		
	I don't want to attend	36 (20%)	
	Very easy.....	33 (19%)	
	Easy.....	44 (25%)	
	Neither.....	11 (6%)	
	Difficult.....	14 (8%)	
	Very difficult.....	9 (5%)	
	Don't know.....	30 (17%)	

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?		
	Yes.....	149 (85%)	
	No.....	23 (13%)	
	Don't know.....	4 (2%)	
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications:		
	<i>(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>		
		Not made one	Yes No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	5 (3%)	84 (51%) 76 (46%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	5 (3%)	69 (47%) 73 (50%)

Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes	80	(48%)	
	No	35	(21%)	
	Don't know	53	(32%)	
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints:			
	<i>(If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	80 (48%)	37 (22%)	51 (30%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	80 (48%)	34 (21%)	51 (31%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes	27	(16%)	
	No	137	(84%)	
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?			
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	85	(51%)	
	Very easy	9	(5%)	
	Easy	13	(8%)	
	Neither	29	(17%)	
	Difficult	14	(8%)	
	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.)			
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	42	(24%)	
	Yes	69	(40%)	
	No	39	(23%)	
	Don't know	23	(13%)	
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>	42	(25%)	
	Yes	60	(36%)	
	No	47	(28%)	
	Don't know	18	(11%)	
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?			
	Yes	10	(6%)	
	No	161	(94%)	
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>	142	(84%)	
	Very well	3	(2%)	
	Well	5	(3%)	
	Neither	7	(4%)	
	Badly	4	(2%)	
	Very badly	9	(5%)	

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes.....	138 (78%)
	No.....	39 (22%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes.....	124 (73%)
	No.....	47 (27%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes.....	44 (25%)
	No.....	134 (75%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	Do not go on association	7 (4%)
	Never.....	46 (27%)
	Rarely.....	55 (32%)
	Some of the time.....	46 (27%)
	Most of the time.....	12 (7%)
	All of the time.....	7 (4%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I have not met him/her	97 (55%)
	In the first week.....	37 (21%)
	More than a week.....	26 (15%)
	Don't remember	16 (9%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her	97 (56%)
	Very helpful.....	25 (14%)
	Helpful.....	26 (15%)
	Neither.....	10 (6%)
	Not very helpful.....	8 (5%)
	Not at all helpful	7 (4%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes.....	69 (39%)
	No.....	107 (61%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes.....	26 (15%)
	No.....	144 (85%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	107 (62%)
	Everywhere.....	16 (9%)
	Segregation unit.....	9 (5%)
	Association areas	31 (18%)
	Reception area.....	5 (3%)
	At the gym.....	6 (3%)
	At mealtimes.....	15 (9%)
	At health services	9 (5%)
	Visits area	13 (8%)
	In wing showers.....	21 (12%)
	In gym showers.....	4 (2%)
	In corridors/stairwells	15 (9%)

<i>In an exercise yard</i>	18 (10%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	17 (10%)
<i>At work</i>	6 (3%)	<i>In your cell</i>	19 (11%)
<i>During movement</i>	25 (15%)	<i>At religious services</i>	3 (2%)
<i>At education</i>	4 (2%)		

Q8.4 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?

Yes	43 (24%)
No.....	133 (76%)

Q8.5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	19 (11%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	21 (12%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	23 (13%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	17 (10%)
<i>Medication</i>	10 (6%)
<i>Debt</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Drugs</i>	10 (6%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	4 (2%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	6 (3%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	7 (4%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	4 (2%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i>	2 (1%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	4 (2%)
<i>You were new here</i>	12 (7%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i>	13 (7%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	9 (5%)

Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes	54 (31%)
No.....	120 (69%)

Q8.7 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	18 (10%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	10 (6%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	18 (10%)
<i>Medication</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Debt</i>	6 (3%)
<i>Drugs</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	10 (6%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	8 (5%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	7 (4%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your age</i>	4 (2%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	4 (2%)
<i>You were new here</i>	14 (8%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i>	12 (7%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	5 (3%)

Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	<i>Not been victimised</i>	110 (69%)
	Yes	19 (12%)
	No	30 (19%)

Section 9: Health services

Q9.1	How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	The doctor	21 (12%)	7 (4%)	34 (20%)	16 (9%)	57 (33%)	39 (22%)
	The nurse	20 (12%)	13 (8%)	46 (28%)	21 (13%)	38 (23%)	26 (16%)
	The dentist	29 (18%)	2 (1%)	6 (4%)	3 (2%)	33 (20%)	91 (55%)

Q9.2	What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	The doctor	25 (15%)	16 (9%)	42 (25%)	34 (20%)	29 (17%)	25 (15%)
	The nurse	19 (12%)	20 (12%)	56 (35%)	31 (19%)	17 (11%)	18 (11%)
	The dentist	57 (36%)	10 (6%)	16 (10%)	20 (13%)	18 (11%)	37 (23%)

Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?	
	<i>Not been</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Very good</i>	20 (12%)
	<i>Good</i>	40 (24%)
	<i>Neither</i>	35 (21%)
	<i>Bad</i>	32 (19%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	23 (14%)

Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	
	Yes	85 (48%)
	No	91 (52%)

Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your own cell?	
	<i>Not taking medication</i>	91 (52%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	20 (11%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	25 (14%)
	<i>No</i>	40 (23%)

Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes	67 (38%)
	No	109 (62%)

Q9.7	Are you being helped/supported by anyone in this prison (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?	
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	109 (62%)
	Yes	22 (13%)
	No	45 (26%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	56 (32%)
	No	120 (68%)

Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	44 (25%)
	No.....	134 (75%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	39 (22%)
	Easy.....	22 (12%)
	Neither.....	15 (8%)
	Difficult.....	10 (6%)
	Very difficult.....	6 (3%)
	Don't know	85 (48%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	15 (9%)
	Easy.....	14 (8%)
	Neither.....	19 (11%)
	Difficult.....	15 (9%)
	Very difficult.....	18 (10%)
	Don't know	93 (53%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes.....	13 (7%)
	No.....	164 (93%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes.....	15 (9%)
	No.....	161 (91%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not/do not have a drug problem</i>	110 (65%)
	Yes.....	37 (22%)
	No.....	21 (13%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not/do not have an alcohol problem</i>	134 (77%)
	Yes.....	26 (15%)
	No.....	13 (8%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/did not receive help</i>	125 (74%)
	Yes.....	40 (24%)
	No.....	4 (2%)

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	19 (11%)	18 (10%)	47 (27%)	21 (12%)	44 (25%)
						25 (14%)

Vocational or skills training	46 (27%)	12 (7%)	35 (21%)	31 (18%)	27 (16%)	17 (10%)
Education (including basic skills)	37 (22%)	12 (7%)	53 (31%)	28 (16%)	27 (16%)	13 (8%)
Offending behaviour programmes	67 (40%)	10 (6%)	16 (10%)	25 (15%)	32 (19%)	18 (11%)

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

Not involved in any of these	61 (36%)
Prison job	77 (46%)
Vocational or skills training.....	18 (11%)
Education (including basic skills).....	32 (19%)
Offending behaviour programmes.....	15 (9%)

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

	Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
Prison job	53 (35%)	47 (31%)	39 (25%)	14 (9%)
Vocational or skills training	63 (50%)	34 (27%)	17 (13%)	12 (10%)
Education (including basic skills)	60 (47%)	39 (31%)	17 (13%)	11 (9%)
Offending behaviour programmes	66 (54%)	30 (24%)	17 (14%)	10 (8%)

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

Don't want to go	24 (14%)
Never	36 (21%)
Less than once a week.....	54 (32%)
About once a week.....	37 (22%)
More than once a week.....	20 (12%)

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

Don't use it	45 (26%)
Yes.....	67 (39%)
No.....	59 (35%)

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

Don't want to go	45 (27%)
0.....	47 (28%)
1 to 2.....	42 (25%)
3 to 5.....	31 (18%)
More than 5.....	4 (2%)

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

Don't want to go	40 (24%)
0.....	44 (26%)
1 to 2.....	56 (33%)
3 to 5.....	17 (10%)
More than 5.....	12 (7%)

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

Don't want to go	8 (5%)
0.....	3 (2%)
1 to 2.....	8 (5%)
3 to 5.....	81 (47%)
More than 5.....	73 (42%)

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>	24 (14%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	53 (31%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	30 (17%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	26 (15%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	12 (7%)

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>	51 (29%)
	<i>No</i>	122 (71%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	70 (40%)
	<i>No</i>	103 (60%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	29 (17%)
	<i>No</i>	144 (83%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	33 (19%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	19 (11%)
	<i>Easy</i>	28 (16%)
	<i>Neither</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	41 (23%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	36 (20%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	7 (4%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	51 (30%)
	<i>Yes</i>	60 (35%)
	<i>No</i>	61 (35%)
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>	112 (65%)
	<i>No contact</i>	30 (17%)
	<i>Letter</i>	18 (10%)
	<i>Phone</i>	11 (6%)
	<i>Visit</i>	16 (9%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	50 (30%)
	<i>No</i>	116 (70%)

Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?			
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	51	(29%)	
	Yes	39	(22%)	
	No	86	(49%)	
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	137	(78%)	
	<i>Very involved</i>	11	(6%)	
	<i>Involved</i>	13	(7%)	
	<i>Neither</i>	4	(2%)	
	<i>Not very involved</i>	5	(3%)	
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	5	(3%)	
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>	137	(80%)	
	<i>Nobody</i>	15	(9%)	
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	9	(5%)	
	<i>Offender manager</i>	9	(5%)	
	<i>Named/personal officer</i>	8	(5%)	
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	9	(5%)	
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	137	(79%)	
	Yes	24	(14%)	
	No	5	(3%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	8	(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>	137	(79%)	
	Yes	9	(5%)	
	No	12	(7%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	15	(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>	137	(79%)	
	Yes	11	(6%)	
	No	15	(9%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	11	(6%)	
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?			
	Yes	10	(6%)	
	No	73	(43%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	85	(51%)	
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?			
	Yes	22	(13%)	
	No	145	(87%)	
Q13.12	Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
		<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
	Employment	32 (20%)	39 (24%)	93 (57%)

Accommodation	39 (25%)	50 (32%)	67 (43%)
Benefits	36 (23%)	55 (34%)	69 (43%)
Finances	37 (25%)	23 (16%)	88 (59%)
Education	41 (27%)	29 (19%)	81 (54%)
Drugs and alcohol	43 (28%)	50 (33%)	60 (39%)

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?

Not sentenced	51 (31%)
Yes	49 (30%)
No.....	64 (39%)

Appendix IVb: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews (open site)

Prisoner survey methodology

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

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 30 October 2012 the prisoner population at HMP Hewell was 177. All of the prisoners were offered a survey.

Selecting the sample

Respondents were randomly selected from a P-Nomis prisoner 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. Ten respondents refused to complete a questionnaire.

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. No 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:

- to have their questionnaire ready to hand back to a member of the research team at a specified time;
- to seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable; or
- to 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, 99 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 56% of the prison population. The response rate was also 56%. In addition to the 10 respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, 45 questionnaires were not returned and 23 were returned blank.

Comparisons

The following details the results from the survey. Data from each establishment has 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 2012 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in open prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in thirteen open prisons since 2008.
- The current survey responses in 2011 against the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Hewell in 2009.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.

In all the above documents, statistical significance is used to indicate whether there is a real difference between the figures, ie. 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 prisoners' background details.

It should be noted that, in order for statistical comparisons to be made between the most recent survey data and that 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 as well as examples of comments made by prisoners. 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 to 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 is excluded). The actual numbers will match up as the data is cleaned to be consistent.

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

Survey summary

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>		30 (30%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>		31 (31%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>		25 (25%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>		11 (11%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>		1 (1%)
	<i>70 and over</i>		1 (1%)
Q1.3	Are you on recall?		
	<i>Yes</i>		1 (1%)
	<i>No</i>		93 (99%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>		1 (1%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>		9 (9%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>		7 (7%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>		22 (22%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>		39 (39%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>		3 (3%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>		8 (8%)
	<i>Life</i>		10 (10%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)		
	<i>Yes</i>		1 (1%)
	<i>No</i>		96 (99%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		98 (99%)
	<i>No</i>		1 (1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		98 (100%)
	<i>No</i>		0 (0%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish).....</i>	61 (62%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese..</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish.....</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - other.....</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean.....</i> 3 (3%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean.....</i>	5 (5%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African.....</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - African.....</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian.....</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Mixed race - other.....</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian.....</i>	13 (13%)	<i>Arab.....</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	8 (8%)	<i>Other ethnic group.....</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....</i>	0 (0%)	

Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?		
	Yes.....	2 (2%)	
	No.....	97 (98%)	
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	None.....	22 (23%)	Hindu..... 1 (1%)
	Church of England.....	33 (35%)	Jewish..... 0 (0%)
	Catholic.....	12 (13%)	Muslim..... 11 (12%)
	Protestant.....	0 (0%)	Sikh..... 10 (11%)
	Other Christian denomination.....	3 (3%)	Other..... 1 (1%)
	Buddhist.....	2 (2%)	
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	Heterosexual/straight.....	95 (97%)	
	Homosexual/gay.....	1 (1%)	
	Bisexual.....	2 (2%)	
Q1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)?		
	Yes.....	9 (9%)	
	No.....	90 (91%)	
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?		
	Yes.....	3 (3%)	
	No.....	96 (97%)	
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	Yes.....	55 (56%)	
	No.....	44 (44%)	
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	Yes.....	53 (54%)	
	No.....	46 (46%)	

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?		
	Less than 2 hours.....	66 (67%)	
	2 hours or longer.....	29 (29%)	
	Don't remember.....	4 (4%)	
Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?		
	My journey was less than two hours.....	66 (67%)	
	Yes.....	19 (19%)	
	No.....	10 (10%)	
	Don't remember.....	3 (3%)	
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?		
	My journey was less than two hours.....	66 (67%)	
	Yes.....	6 (6%)	
	No.....	25 (26%)	
	Don't remember.....	1 (1%)	

Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes.....	64 (65%)
	No.....	27 (28%)
	Don't remember	7 (7%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes.....	75 (77%)
	No.....	17 (17%)
	Don't remember	6 (6%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well.....	30 (31%)
	Well.....	42 (43%)
	Neither.....	20 (20%)
	Badly.....	1 (1%)
	Very badly	2 (2%)
	Don't remember	3 (3%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	74 (76%)
	Yes, I received written information.....	11 (11%)
	No, I was not told anything.....	13 (13%)
	Don't remember	3 (3%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes.....	86 (88%)
	No.....	10 (10%)
	Don't remember	2 (2%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	67 (68%)
	2 hours or longer.....	28 (29%)
	Don't remember	3 (3%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes.....	70 (72%)
	No	21 (22%)
	Don't remember	6 (6%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well.....	20 (20%)
	Well.....	42 (43%)
	Neither.....	22 (22%)
	Badly.....	10 (10%)
	Very badly.....	3 (3%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Loss of property	14 (15%)
	Housing problems.....	3 (3%)
	Physical health	7 (7%)
	Mental health.....	3 (3%)

Contacting employers	1 (1%)	Needing protection from other prisoners.....	0 (0%)
Contacting family	21 (22%)	Getting phone numbers	14 (15%)
Childcare	1 (1%)	Other.....	9 (9%)
Money worries.....	14 (15%)	Did not have any problems	46 (48%)
Feeling depressed or suicidal.....	6 (6%)		

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

Yes	15 (16%)
No.....	34 (36%)
Did not have any problems	46 (48%)

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

Tobacco.....	43 (44%)
A shower	24 (25%)
A free telephone call.....	52 (54%)
Something to eat.....	34 (35%)
PIN phone credit.....	45 (46%)
Toiletries/basic items.....	25 (26%)
Did not receive anything	22 (23%)

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

Chaplain	56 (57%)
Someone from health services.....	55 (56%)
A Listener/Samaritans.....	48 (49%)
Prison shop/canteen.....	15 (15%)
Did not have access to any of these	19 (19%)

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

What was going to happen to you.....	58 (61%)
What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	39 (41%)
How to make routine requests (applications).....	50 (53%)
Your entitlement to visits.....	50 (53%)
Health services	51 (54%)
Chaplaincy	52 (55%)
Not offered any information	21 (22%)

Q3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?

Yes	74 (77%)
No.....	15 (16%)
Don't remember	7 (7%)

Q3.10 How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?

Have not been on an induction course	8 (8%)
Within the first week	83 (86%)
More than a week	5 (5%)
Don't remember	0 (0%)

Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?

Have not been on an induction course	8 (9%)
Yes	44 (47%)

No..... 36 (39%)
 Don't remember 5 (5%)

Q3.12 How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?

Did not receive an assessment..... 17 (18%)
 Within the first week 47 (50%)
 More than a week 15 (16%)
 Don't remember 15 (16%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1 How easy is it to:

	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	19 (20%)	32 (34%)	19 (20%)	10 (11%)	4 (4%)	11 (12%)
Attend legal visits?	20 (24%)	21 (25%)	16 (19%)	8 (10%)	0 (0%)	19 (23%)

Q4.2 Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?

Not had any letters..... 18 (19%)
 Yes 30 (32%)
 No..... 47 (49%)

Q4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?

Yes 52 (54%)
 No..... 6 (6%)
 Don't know 38 (40%)

Q4.4 Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:

	Yes	No	Don't know
Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	92 (97%)	3 (3%)	0 (0%)
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	72 (76%)	14 (15%)	9 (9%)
Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	55 (58%)	36 (38%)	4 (4%)
Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	64 (69%)	28 (30%)	1 (1%)
If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	40 (44%)	26 (29%)	24 (27%)

Q4.5 What is the food like here?

Very good..... 3 (3%)
 Good..... 27 (29%)
 Neither..... 25 (27%)
 Bad..... 17 (18%)
 Very bad..... 20 (22%)

Q4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?

Have not bought anything yet/don't know..... 1 (1%)
 Yes 34 (35%)
 No..... 61 (64%)

Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	
	Yes.....	47 (49%)
	No.....	9 (9%)
	Don't know.....	40 (42%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes.....	55 (57%)
	No.....	9 (9%)
	Don't know/N/A.....	32 (33%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes.....	68 (72%)
	No.....	4 (4%)
	Don't know/N/A.....	22 (23%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	28 (29%)
	Very easy.....	30 (31%)
	Easy.....	11 (11%)
	Neither.....	2 (2%)
	Difficult.....	4 (4%)
	Very difficult.....	3 (3%)
	Don't know.....	18 (19%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?			
	Yes.....	81 (84%)		
	No.....	10 (10%)		
	Don't know.....	6 (6%)		
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications: (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with fairly?	12 (13%)	47 (52%)	31 (34%)
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	12 (13%)	50 (56%)	27 (30%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes.....	33 (35%)		
	No.....	16 (17%)		
	Don't know.....	46 (48%)		
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints: (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with fairly?	64 (69%)	10 (11%)	19 (20%)
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	64 (71%)	9 (10%)	17 (19%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes.....	9 (10%)		
	No.....	77 (90%)		

Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	47 (52%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	9 (10%)
	<i>Easy</i>	9 (10%)
	<i>Neither</i>	17 (19%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	4 (4%)

Section 6: Relationships with staff

Q6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	<i>Yes</i>	73 (82%)
	<i>No</i>	16 (18%)
Q6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	<i>Yes</i>	77 (83%)
	<i>No</i>	16 (17%)
Q6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	<i>Yes</i>	28 (30%)
	<i>No</i>	66 (70%)
Q6.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	7 (7%)
	<i>Never</i>	19 (20%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	27 (29%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	27 (29%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	10 (11%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	4 (4%)
Q6.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	20 (22%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	36 (39%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	30 (32%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (8%)
Q6.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her</i>	20 (22%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	27 (29%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	24 (26%)
	<i>Neither</i>	13 (14%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	6 (6%)

Section 7: Safety

Q7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	21 (22%)
	<i>No</i>	74 (78%)
Q7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	<i>Yes</i>	9 (10%)
	<i>No</i>	83 (90%)

Q7.3 In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Never felt unsafe	74 (81%)	<i>At mealtimes</i>	4 (4%)
<i>Everywhere</i>	4 (4%)	<i>At health services</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Association areas</i>	3 (3%)	<i>Visits area</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Reception area</i>	0 (0%)	<i>In wing showers</i>	3 (3%)
<i>At the gym</i>	4 (4%)	<i>In gym showers</i>	1 (1%)
<i>In an exercise yard</i>	1 (1%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	6 (7%)
<i>At work</i>	3 (3%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	2 (2%)
<i>During movement</i>	1 (1%)	<i>In your cell</i>	5 (5%)
<i>At education</i>	2 (2%)	<i>At religious services</i>	0 (0%)

Q7.4 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?

Yes	12 (13%)
No.....	81 (87%)

Q7.5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	6 (7%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	4 (4%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Medication</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Drugs</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	3 (3%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your age</i>	2 (2%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You were new here</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	2 (2%)

Q7.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes	18 (20%)
No.....	74 (80%)

Q7.7 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	5 (5%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	8 (9%)
<i>Medication</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	2 (2%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	1 (1%)

Your sexual orientation.....	1 (1%)
Your age.....	1 (1%)
You have a disability.....	2 (2%)
You were new here.....	2 (2%)
Your offence/crime.....	2 (2%)
Gang related issues.....	2 (2%)

Q7.8 If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?

Not been victimised	68 (76%)
Yes.....	7 (8%)
No.....	14 (16%)

Section 8: Health services

Q8.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	14 (15%)	8 (9%)	26 (28%)	16 (17%)	22 (24%)	7 (8%)
The nurse	8 (9%)	23 (25%)	34 (37%)	13 (14%)	10 (11%)	4 (4%)
The dentist	22 (24%)	4 (4%)	12 (13%)	11 (12%)	27 (29%)	16 (17%)

Q8.2 What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	15 (17%)	7 (8%)	18 (20%)	23 (26%)	15 (17%)	12 (13%)
The nurse	10 (11%)	10 (11%)	34 (37%)	17 (18%)	13 (14%)	8 (9%)
The dentist	36 (40%)	4 (4%)	17 (19%)	16 (18%)	8 (9%)	9 (10%)

Q8.3 What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?

Not been	10 (11%)
<i>Very good</i>	6 (7%)
<i>Good</i>	27 (30%)
<i>Neither</i>	19 (21%)
<i>Bad</i>	18 (20%)
<i>Very bad</i>	11 (12%)

Q8.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes.....	35 (37%)
No.....	59 (63%)

Q8.5 If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your own cell?

Not taking medication	59 (63%)
Yes, all my meds.....	31 (33%)
Yes, some of my meds.....	4 (4%)
No.....	0 (0%)

Q8.6 Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?

Yes.....	3 (3%)
No.....	91 (97%)

Q8.7 Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison (e.g. psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?

Do not have any emotional or mental health problems	91 (97%)
Yes.....	1 (1%)
No.....	2 (2%)

Section 9: Drugs and alcohol

Q9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	8 (9%)
	No	85 (91%)
Q9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	6 (6%)
	No	87 (94%)
Q9.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	32 (34%)
	Easy	7 (7%)
	Neither	6 (6%)
	Difficult	0 (0%)
	Very difficult	1 (1%)
	Don't know	48 (51%)
Q9.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	23 (24%)
	Easy	11 (12%)
	Neither	9 (10%)
	Difficult	1 (1%)
	Very difficult	3 (3%)
	Don't know	47 (50%)
Q9.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	4 (4%)
	No	89 (96%)
Q9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	2 (2%)
	No	91 (98%)
Q9.7	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not/do not have a drug problem</i>	81 (87%)
	Yes	7 (8%)
	No	5 (5%)
Q9.8	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not/do not have an alcohol problem</i>	87 (94%)
	Yes	4 (4%)
	No	2 (2%)
Q9.9	Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/did not receive help</i>	81 (89%)
	Yes	5 (5%)
	No	5 (5%)

Section 10: Activities

Q10.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?					
		Don't know	Very Easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult
						Very difficult
	Prison job	6 (7%)	30 (33%)	38 (42%)	11 (12%)	4 (4%)
	Vocational or skills training	12 (13%)	17 (19%)	35 (39%)	17 (19%)	4 (4%)
	Education (including basic skills)	8 (9%)	25 (27%)	37 (41%)	13 (14%)	3 (3%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	36 (41%)	10 (11%)	16 (18%)	17 (19%)	4 (5%)
						5 (6%)
						5 (6%)
Q10.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)					
	Not involved in any of these					14 (16%)
	Prison job					50 (57%)
	Vocational or skills training.....					21 (24%)
	Education (including basic skills).....					29 (33%)
	Offending behaviour programmes.....					5 (6%)
Q10.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?					
		Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know	
	Prison job	10 (13%)	24 (31%)	35 (45%)	8 (10%)	
	Vocational or skills training	16 (23%)	36 (51%)	14 (20%)	5 (7%)	
	Education (including basic skills)	12 (17%)	36 (50%)	18 (25%)	6 (8%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes	22 (38%)	10 (17%)	19 (33%)	7 (12%)	
Q10.4	How often do you usually go to the library?					
	Don't want to go					10 (11%)
	Never.....					7 (8%)
	Less than once a week.....					12 (13%)
	About once a week.....					13 (14%)
	More than once a week.....					51 (55%)
Q10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?					
	Don't use it					18 (19%)
	Yes.....					51 (55%)
	No.....					24 (26%)
Q10.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?					
	Don't want to go					18 (19%)
	0.....					6 (6%)
	1 to 2.....					13 (14%)
	3 to 5.....					34 (37%)
	More than 5.....					22 (24%)
Q10.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?					
	Don't want to go					6 (7%)
	0.....					7 (8%)
	1 to 2.....					27 (29%)
	3 to 5.....					18 (20%)

More than 5..... 34 (37%)

Q10.8 How many times do you usually have association each week?

Don't want to go..... 6 (7%)
0..... 4 (4%)
1 to 2 7 (8%)
3 to 5 6 (7%)
More than 5 68 (75%)

Q10.9 How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)

Less than 2 hours 3 (3%)
2 to less than 4 hours..... 4 (5%)
4 to less than 6 hours..... 8 (9%)
6 to less than 8 hours..... 5 (6%)
8 to less than 10 hours..... 4 (5%)
10 hours or more..... 57 (66%)
Don't know 6 (7%)

Section 11: Contact with family and friends

Q11.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?

Yes..... 60 (67%)
No..... 29 (33%)

Q11.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?

Yes..... 21 (23%)
No..... 72 (77%)

Q11.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?

Yes..... 14 (15%)
No..... 77 (85%)

Q11.4 How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?

I don't get visits..... 5 (5%)
Very easy 25 (27%)
Easy..... 31 (33%)
Neither..... 12 (13%)
Difficult..... 7 (8%)
Very difficult 12 (13%)
Don't know 1 (1%)

Section 12: Preparation for release

Q12.1 Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?

Yes..... 70 (75%)
No..... 23 (25%)

Q12.2 What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Do not have an offender manager/N/A..... 23 (28%)

	No contact.....	12 (15%)
	Letter.....	31 (38%)
	Phone	24 (29%)
	Visit	23 (28%)
Q12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes.....	36 (40%)
	No.....	55 (60%)
Q12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	Yes.....	60 (65%)
	No.....	33 (35%)
Q12.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	Do not have a sentence plan	33 (35%)
	Very involved.....	20 (22%)
	Involved.....	20 (22%)
	Neither.....	6 (6%)
	Not very involved	6 (6%)
	Not at all involved	8 (9%)
Q12.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Do not have a sentence plan	33 (38%)
	Nobody.....	26 (30%)
	Offender supervisor.....	17 (20%)
	Offender manager.....	14 (16%)
	Named/personal officer.....	12 (14%)
	Staff from other departments.....	13 (15%)
Q12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	Do not have a sentence plan	33 (38%)
	Yes.....	37 (43%)
	No.....	9 (10%)
	Don't know	7 (8%)
Q12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?	
	Do not have a sentence plan	33 (38%)
	Yes.....	5 (6%)
	No.....	42 (48%)
	Don't know	8 (9%)
Q12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?	
	Do not have a sentence plan	33 (38%)
	Yes.....	19 (22%)
	No.....	27 (31%)
	Don't know	8 (9%)
Q12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	
	Yes	6 (7%)
	No.....	59 (66%)
	Don't know	25 (28%)
Q12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?	
	Yes.....	20 (23%)

No..... 67 (77%)

Q12.12 Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	27 (32%)	31 (36%)	27 (32%)
Accommodation	33 (42%)	19 (24%)	27 (34%)
Benefits	26 (33%)	18 (23%)	35 (44%)
Finances	30 (38%)	15 (19%)	35 (44%)
Education	29 (37%)	26 (33%)	24 (30%)
Drugs and alcohol	37 (47%)	20 (25%)	22 (28%)

Q12.13 Have you been provided with information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

	Yes	No
Resettlement day release	64 (71%)	26 (29%)
Resettlement overnight release	61 (69%)	28 (31%)

Q12.14 Have you had access to the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

	Yes	No
Resettlement day release	51 (57%)	38 (43%)
Resettlement overnight release	41 (48%)	45 (52%)
Special purpose leave	35 (43%)	46 (57%)

Q12.15 Please answer the following questions on your preparation for release?

	Yes	No
Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here	24 (26%)	67 (74%)
Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility, freedom e.t.c.)	26 (29%)	63 (71%)
Do you feel you have been given a greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions	63 (70%)	27 (30%)
Have you been on a preparation for release course	18 (21%)	69 (79%)
Is this prison near your home area or intended release address	55 (61%)	35 (39%)
Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that will make you less likely to offend in the future	54 (60%)	36 (40%)

Appendix V: Photographs

Cleaned wing area which remained dirty and litter strewn



Paint peeling from the ceiling in a shower area on the closed site



Washing facilities at the closed site



Yards strewn with litter



Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Hewell (closed) 2012

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

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	HMP Hewell (closed) 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				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		182	5545	182	120
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	1%	6%	1%	1%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	71%	68%	71%	66%
1.3	Are you on recall?	10%	10%	10%	8%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	26%	20%	26%	18%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	3%	3%	3%	2%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	13%	12%	13%	13%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	99%	97%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	96%	98%	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)?	26%	24%	26%	29%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	5%	5%	5%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	10%	11%	10%	11%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	1%	3%	1%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	18%	21%	18%	15%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	7%	6%	7%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	37%	29%	37%	27%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	55%	53%	55%	64%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	23%	19%	23%	28%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	39%	40%	39%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	8%	9%	8%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	59%	65%	59%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	73%	78%	73%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	68%	67%	68%	53%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	59%	69%	59%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	7%	5%	7%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	82%	82%	82%	83%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	HMP Hewell (closed) 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				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	34%	47%	34%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	70%	75%	70%	62%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	58%	60%	58%	40%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	74%	75%	74%	75%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	13%	14%	13%	14%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	21%	24%	21%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	4%	7%	4%	8%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	31%	32%	31%	34%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	3%	6%	3%	7%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	27%	22%	27%	17%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	20%	21%	20%	26%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	18%	17%	18%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	22%	18%	22%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	6%	9%	6%	10%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	32%	30%	32%	35%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	33%	39%	33%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	88%	86%	88%	86%
3.6	A shower?	16%	33%	16%	20%
3.6	A free telephone call?	78%	56%	78%	68%
3.6	Something to eat?	67%	78%	67%	81%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	63%	54%	63%	
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	47%	57%	47%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Key to tables		HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	HMP Hewell (closed) 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					
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:					
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	49%	51%	49%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	68%	73%	68%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	55%	38%	55%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	14%	15%	14%	5%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:					
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	43%	49%	43%	33%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	41%	48%	41%	35%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	38%	40%	38%	36%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	38%	45%	38%	38%
3.8	Health services?	47%	52%	47%	43%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	40%	48%	40%	44%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	76%	73%	76%	60%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	74%	77%	74%	87%
For those who have been on an induction course:					
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	49%	58%	49%	60%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	70%	72%	70%	
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:					
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	39%	41%	39%	47%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	61%	58%	61%	61%
4.1	Get bail information?	21%	23%	21%	20%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	42%	40%	42%	43%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	46%	38%	46%	
For the wing/unit you are currently on:					
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	46%	54%	46%	45%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	88%	79%	88%	97%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	73%	81%	73%	83%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	44%	63%	44%	65%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	23%	38%	23%	33%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	70%	64%	70%	62%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	17%	27%	17%	20%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	21%	24%	21%	21%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	50%	46%	50%	40%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	64%	59%	64%	54%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	46%	53%	46%	55%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	61%	55%	61%	59%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	44%	45%	44%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	HMP Hewell (closed) 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				
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	85%	81%	85%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	53%	57%	53%	52%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	49%	47%	49%	41%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	48%	60%	48%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	42%	32%	42%	21%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	40%	36%	40%	29%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	17%	16%	17%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	13%	22%	13%	13%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	40%	49%	40%	52%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	36%	45%	36%	41%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	6%	7%	6%	4%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit, were you treated very well/well by staff?	29%	38%	29%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	78%	72%	78%	68%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	73%	73%	73%	71%
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?	11%	18%	11%	22%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	45%	46%	45%	58%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	67%	64%	67%	69%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	Local prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	39%	41%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	15%	17%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	25%	22%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	11%	10%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	12%	7%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	13%	15%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	10%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	6%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	6%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	7%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	5%	4%

HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	HMP Hewell (closed) 2009
39%	38%
15%	17%
25%	20%
11%	8%
12%	6%
2%	0%
13%	
10%	5%
6%	
4%	
6%	3%
4%	5%
2%	4%
3%	
4%	5%
2%	
0%	0%
1%	4%
2%	3%
7%	9%
7%	4%
5%	2%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	HMP Hewell (closed) 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				
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	31%	26%	31%	26%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	11%	10%	13%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	5%	6%	4%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	13%	10%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	5%	6%	5%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	2%	3%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	5%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	5%	3%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	3%	6%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	3%	5%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	3%	4%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%	2%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	6%	8%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	7%	5%	7%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	2%	3%	4%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	39%	33%	39%	30%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	HMP Hewell (closed) 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				
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	24%	26%	24%	24%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	36%	53%	36%	39%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	5%	11%	5%	6%
	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?	40%	44%	40%	44%
9.2	The nurse?	54%	58%	54%	53%
9.2	The dentist?	26%	31%	26%	33%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	40%	39%	40%	36%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	48%	51%	48%	46%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	53%	66%	53%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	38%	34%	38%	40%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	33%	40%	33%	
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	32%	36%	32%	38%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	25%	27%	25%	25%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	35%	29%	35%	20%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	17%	14%	17%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	7%	8%	7%	10%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	9%	9%	9%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	64%	65%	64%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	67%	57%	67%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	91%	79%	91%	69%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	HMP Hewell (closed) 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				
SECTION 11: Activities				
Is it very easy/easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1 A prison job?	37%	32%	37%	
11.1 Vocational or skills training?	28%	28%	28%	
11.1 Education (including basic skills)?	38%	42%	38%	
11.1 Offending behaviour programmes?	15%	21%	15%	
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2 A prison job?	46%	44%	46%	53%
11.2 Vocational or skills training?	11%	9%	11%	16%
11.2 Education (including basic skills)?	19%	27%	19%	25%
11.2 Offending Behaviour Programmes?	9%	8%	9%	5%
11.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	65%	69%	65%	78%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	47%	42%	47%	40%
11.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	50%	54%	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?	54%	49%	54%	56%
11.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	53%	66%	53%	63%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	58%	57%	58%	66%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	46%	52%	46%	50%
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?	53%	48%	53%	50%
11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	33%	36%	33%	41%
11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	39%	34%	39%	
11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	21%	31%	21%	23%
11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	17%	38%	17%	24%
11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	42%	47%	42%	78%
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	8%	10%	8%	8%
SECTION 12: Friends and family				
12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	30%	35%	30%	32%
12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	41%	46%	41%	51%
12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	17%	34%	17%	18%
12.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	27%	34%	27%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (closed) 2012	HMP Hewell (closed) 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				
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	50%	62%	50%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	50%	40%	50%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	30%	28%	30%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	18%	16%	18%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	27%	37%	27%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	30%	30%	30%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	31%	40%	31%	53%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	63%	56%	63%	57%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	43%	43%	43%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	26%	32%	26%	
13.6	Offender manager?	26%	31%	26%	
13.6	Named/personal officer?	23%	16%	23%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	26%	21%	26%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	65%	62%	65%	70%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	25%	25%	25%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	30%	32%	30%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	6%	6%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	13%	15%	13%	17%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:					
13.12	Employment?	30%	30%	30%	
13.12	Accommodation?	43%	44%	43%	
13.12	Benefits?	44%	47%	44%	
13.12	Finances?	21%	28%	21%	
13.12	Education?	26%	33%	26%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	46%	48%	46%	
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?	43%	46%	43%	45%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and foreign national) HMP Hewell (closed) 2012

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British national 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						
Number of completed questionnaires returned		46	134	23	156	17	162
1.3	Are you sentenced?	62%	74%	86%	68%	65%	72%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	26%	8%			6%	13%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	91%	99%	78%	99%	100%	97%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	91%	98%	33%	0%	100%	96%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			52%	22%	83%	19%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	4%	5%	9%	4%	0%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	31%	2%	5%	10%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	11%	21%	23%	18%	0%	20%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	9%	7%	14%	6%	7%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	46%	33%	78%	31%	30%	36%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	65%	69%	52%	62%	76%	67%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	54%	61%	64%	69%	53%	60%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	63%	72%	70%	70%	59%	71%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	56%	59%	68%	57%	53%	58%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	74%	74%	67%	75%	76%	73%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	70%	67%	77%	67%	81%	66%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	84%	74%	86%	75%	76%	77%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	81%	71%	91%	71%	89%	71%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	38%	41%	58%	37%	47%	39%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British national 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						
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	47%	46%	55%	43%	53%	45%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	87%	88%	77%	89%	94%	88%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	20%	24%	28%	23%	32%	23%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	18%	22%	28%	20%	25%	20%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	36%	55%	48%	50%	32%	53%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	53%	68%	48%	66%	65%	64%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	42%	47%	53%	46%	60%	45%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	52%	64%	64%	60%	47%	63%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	77%	88%	76%	86%	70%	87%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	37%	52%	40%	49%	43%	49%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	29%	44%	20%	43%	37%	41%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	41%	35%	21%	38%	46%	35%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	9%	4%	9%	6%	0%	6%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	70%	81%	68%	80%	76%	79%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	68%	74%	72%	73%	53%	75%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	9%	12%	5%	12%	7%	11%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	38%	48%	38%	45%	25%	48%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	55%	34%	33%	40%	37%	39%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	24%	12%	9%	16%	25%	14%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	31%	23%	19%	25%	24%	25%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	7%	16%	5%	15%	6%	14%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	7%	3%	5%	3%	6%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	2%	2%	0%	3%	6%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	4%	3%	0%	4%	6%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	3%	0%	3%	0%	3%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British national 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?	43%	27%	25%	33%	41%	30%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	4%	12%	5%	11%	0%	11%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	4%	2%	5%	3%	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	7%	5%	0%	7%	18%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	4%	4%	5%	5%	6%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	3%	0%	3%	0%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	22%	24%	22%	24%	30%	23%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	32%	38%	39%	36%	29%	36%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	34%	54%	45%	48%	18%	51%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	34%	40%	37%	39%	30%	38%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	22%	39%	28%	35%	11%	37%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	51%	43%	43%	47%	44%	46%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	20%	7%	19%	10%	25%	9%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	24%	17%	43%	15%	19%	19%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	5%	10%	9%	9%	0%	9%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	22%	36%	42%	32%	40%	33%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	26%	19%	27%	20%	20%	21%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	10%	20%	6%	18%	13%	17%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	35%	45%	35%	44%	40%	43%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	9%	8%	9%	7%	0%	9%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	40%	41%	33%	41%	20%	42%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	18%	17%	25%	16%	11%	18%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability) HMP Hewell (closed) 2012

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		33	146
1.3	Are you sentenced?	79%	69%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	16%	12%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	97%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	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)?	15%	28%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	13%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	12%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?		
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%	7%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	21%	40%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67%	68%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	61%	59%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	61%	72%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	61%	57%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	94%	70%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from healthcare when you first arrived here?	66%	68%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	75%	76%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	64%	76%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	33%	40%

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?	51%	44%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	88%	89%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	21%	24%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	18%	21%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	50%	50%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	52%	66%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	48%	45%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	64%	60%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	90%	83%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	52%	46%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	41%	40%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	25%	38%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	6%	6%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	81%	77%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	63%	74%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	13%	9%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	27%	48%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	46%	38%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	25%	13%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	28%	24%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	16%	13%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	6%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	3%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	6%	1%

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		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	40%	29%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	17%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	4%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	4%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	4%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	6%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	16%	26%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	28%	38%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	81%	41%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	75%	30%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	30%	35%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	32%	49%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	6%	12%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	26%	18%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	19%	6%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	28%	34%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	13%	23%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	13%	19%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	37%	43%
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%	10%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	41%	41%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	19%	16%

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Hewell (Open) 2012

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

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	HMP Hewell (Open) 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				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		99	1510	99	60
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	1%	0%	0%
1.3	Are you on recall?	1%	3%	1%	5%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	10%	7%	10%	26%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	8%	7%	8%	0%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	1%	4%	1%	7%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	99%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%	100%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	34%	26%	34%	30%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	2%	3%	2%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	12%	12%	12%	7%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3%	2%	3%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	9%	10%	9%	9%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	7%	3%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	55%	51%	55%	57%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	54%	54%	54%	52%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	29%	46%	29%	21%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	60%	82%	60%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	19%	12%	19%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	65%	70%	65%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	77%	83%	77%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	73%	72%	73%	55%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	75%	78%	75%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	11%	19%	11%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	88%	94%	88%	90%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	HMP Hewell (Open) 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				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	69%	69%	69%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	72%	87%	72%	69%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	63%	78%	63%	56%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	52%	41%	52%	65%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	15%	8%	15%	14%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	3%	11%	3%	14%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	3%	1%	0%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	22%	11%	22%	17%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	3%	1%	8%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	15%	11%	15%	12%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	7%	6%	7%	16%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	8%	8%	8%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	3%	5%	3%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	0%	2%	0%	2%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	15%	8%	15%	27%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	31%	40%	31%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	44%	73%	44%	74%
3.6	A shower?	25%	54%	25%	42%
3.6	A free telephone call?	53%	45%	53%	68%
3.6	Something to eat?	35%	68%	35%	80%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	47%	61%	47%	
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	26%	50%	26%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	HMP Hewell (Open) 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				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued				
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7 The chaplain or a religious leader?	57%	56%	57%	
3.7 Someone from health services?	56%	78%	56%	
3.7 A Listener/Samaritans?	49%	36%	49%	
3.7 Prison shop/canteen?	15%	21%	15%	5%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8 What was going to happen to you?	61%	63%	61%	40%
3.8 Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	41%	47%	41%	36%
3.8 How to make routine requests?	53%	56%	53%	36%
3.8 Your entitlement to visits?	53%	59%	53%	42%
3.8 Health services?	54%	67%	54%	42%
3.8 The chaplaincy?	55%	55%	55%	36%
3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?	77%	92%	77%	71%
3.10 Have you been on an induction course?	92%	96%	92%	93%
For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11 Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	52%	75%	52%	56%
3.12 Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	82%	83%	82%	
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody				
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1 Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	54%	65%	54%	39%
4.1 Attend legal visits?	49%	55%	49%	52%
4.2 Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	32%	25%	32%	42%
4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?	54%	45%	54%	
For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4 Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	98%	97%	98%
4.4 Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	76%	88%	76%	88%
4.4 Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	58%	75%	58%	69%
4.4 Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	69%	80%	69%	69%
4.4 Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	44%	55%	44%	45%
4.5 Is the food in this prison good/very good?	33%	42%	33%	22%
4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	36%	48%	36%	45%
4.7 Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	49%	59%	49%	64%
4.8 Are your religious beliefs are respected?	57%	57%	57%	49%
4.9 Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	72%	64%	72%	59%
4.10 Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	43%	52%	43%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	HMP Hewell (Open) 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				
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	83%	92%	83%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	60%	79%	60%	54%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	65%	73%	65%	47%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	35%	58%	35%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	35%	47%	35%	40%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	35%	53%	35%	21%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	10%	14%	10%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	20%	41%	20%	29%
SECTION 6: Relationships with staff					
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	82%	76%	82%	68%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	83%	77%	83%	72%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	30%	25%	30%	
6.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	15%	18%	15%	15%
6.5	Do you have a personal officer?	78%	70%	78%	47%
	For those with a personal officer:				
6.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	70%	74%	70%	46%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	HMP Hewell (Open) 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				
SECTION 7: Safety					
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	22%	16%	22%	31%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	10%	5%	10%	10%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	13%	8%	13%	10%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
7.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	7%	4%	7%	5%
7.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	1%	1%	1%	3%
7.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	0%	1%	2%
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	4%	8%	4%	
7.5	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	1%	3%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	1%	1%	
7.5	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	1%	1%	
7.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	1%	2%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	1%	1%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	1%	0%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	1%	1%	
7.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	1%	3%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%	0%	
7.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	1%	2%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	2%	3%	7%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	2%	0%	
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	1%	2%	0%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	HMP Hewell (Open) 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				
SECTION 7: Safety continued					
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	20%	16%	20%	17%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	6%	6%	6%	5%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	9%	9%	
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	0%	3%	
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	3%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	3%	1%	3%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	2%	2%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	1%	2%	
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	2%	1%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%	0%	1%	
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	0%	1%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	1%	2%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	4%	2%	5%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	2%	2%	3%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	1%	2%	0%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
7.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	34%	26%	34%	35%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	HMP Hewell (Open) 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				
SECTION 8: Health services					
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	37%	59%	37%	69%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	62%	78%	62%	85%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	18%	31%	18%	28%
	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:				
8.2	The doctor?	33%	74%	33%	71%
8.2	The nurse?	54%	79%	54%	86%
8.2	The dentist?	39%	57%	39%	45%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	41%	69%	41%	65%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	37%	43%	37%	37%
	For those currently taking medication:				
8.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	100%	99%	100%	
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	3%	12%	3%	21%
	For those who have problems:				
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	33%	51%	33%	
SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol					
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	8%	10%	8%	12%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	7%	8%	7%	5%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	42%	31%	42%	37%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	36%	24%	36%	
9.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	4%	3%	4%	0%
9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	2%	2%	2%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
9.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	59%	69%	59%	
9.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	64%	78%	64%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
9.9	Was the support helpful?	50%	88%	50%	73%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	HMP Hewell (Open) 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				
SECTION 10: Activities					
Is it very easy/easy to get into the following activities:					
10.1	A prison job?	75%	81%	75%	
10.1	Vocational or skills training?	58%	54%	58%	
10.1	Education (including basic skills)?	68%	71%	68%	
10.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	30%	29%	30%	
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:					
10.2	A prison job?	58%	75%	58%	77%
10.2	Vocational or skills training?	24%	22%	24%	26%
10.2	Education (including basic skills)?	33%	28%	33%	46%
10.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	6%	9%	6%	9%
10.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	87%	93%	87%	96%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:					
10.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	36%	46%	36%	37%
10.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	77%	81%	77%	75%
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:					
10.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	65%	67%	65%	48%
10.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	84%	85%	84%	87%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:					
10.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	60%	69%	60%	65%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	62%	71%	62%	63%
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?	28%	53%	28%	17%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	69%	55%	69%	63%
10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	55%	59%	55%	
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	60%	54%	60%	60%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	56%	76%	56%	73%
10.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	75%	84%	75%	83%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	65%	50%	65%	39%
SECTION 11: Friends and family					
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	67%	54%	67%	50%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	23%	21%	23%	23%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	15%	12%	15%	11%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	60%	33%	60%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell (Open) 2012	HMP Hewell (Open) 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				
SECTION 12: Preparation for release					
12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	75%	92%	75%	
	For those who have an offender manager what type of contact have you had:				
12.2	No contact?	20%	12%	20%	
12.2	Contact by letter?	52%	44%	52%	
12.2	Contact by phone?	41%	64%	41%	
12.2	Contact by visit?	39%	38%	39%	
12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	40%	68%	40%	
12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	65%	74%	65%	58%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
12.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	67%	71%	67%	54%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
12.6	nobody?	49%	33%	49%	
12.6	Offender supervisor?	31%	49%	31%	
12.6	Offender manager?	26%	39%	26%	
12.6	Named/ personal officer?	22%	19%	22%	
12.6	Staff from other departments?	24%	20%	24%	
	For those with a sentence plan:				
12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	70%	81%	70%	83%
12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	9%	10%	9%	
12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	35%	52%	35%	
12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	7%	5%	7%	
12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	23%	33%	23%	14%
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:				
12.12	Employment?	53%	49%	53%	
12.12	Accommodation?	42%	47%	42%	
12.12	Benefits?	34%	49%	34%	
12.12	Finances?	30%	41%	30%	
12.12	Education?	52%	52%	52%	
12.12	Drugs and alcohol?	48%	58%	48%	
	Have you been provided with information on the following:				
12.13	Resettlement day release?	71%	76%	71%	
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	69%	76%	69%	
	Have you had access to the following:				
12.14	Resettlement day release?	57%	67%	57%	
12.14	Resettlement overnight release?	47%	62%	47%	
12.14	Special purpose leave?	43%	35%	43%	
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:				
12.15	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	26%	24%	26%	19%
12.15	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	29%	28%	29%	15%
12.15	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	70%	83%	70%	68%
12.15	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	21%	19%	21%	10%
12.15	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	61%	41%	61%	75%
12.15	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	60%	59%	60%	44%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMP Hewell 2012

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		33	65	11	84
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	3%	0%	0%	1%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			100%	26%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	3%	0%	1%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	32%	0%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	12%	8%	10%	9%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	3%	0%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	64%	51%	74%	54%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	73%	75%	65%	75%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	76%	75%	80%	74%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	73%	73%	65%	72%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	54%	69%	45%	68%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	54%	50%	55%	52%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	58%	56%	80%	53%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	78%	78%	74%	78%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	88%	94%	80%	93%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	58%	52%	50%	56%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	96%	100%	97%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	19%	41%	22%	34%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	19%	44%	0%	39%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	32%	58%	11%	53%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	75%	48%	100%	52%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	75%	73%	72%	72%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	75%	88%	72%	87%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	16%	45%	11%	38%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	68%	89%	78%	82%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	72%	88%	89%	81%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	7%	19%	11%	15%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	63%	87%	50%	83%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	25%	19%	28%	20%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	9%	8%	11%	10%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	16%	10%	24%	12%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	4%	5%	0%	5%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	4%	0%	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	0%	0%	0%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	4%	0%	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	0%	0%	0%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	32%	13%	28%	18%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	13%	7%	11%	9%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	4%	0%	0%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	4%	2%	0%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	7%	0%	0%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	4%	0%	3%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	19%	45%	22%	38%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	46%	70%	56%	62%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	35%	38%	39%	37%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	0%	5%	0%	3%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	44%	39%	50%	40%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	48%	63%	44%	59%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	21%	25%	13%	26%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	41%	28%	44%	32%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	14%	2%	13%	5%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	66%	70%	50%	71%
10.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	66%	58%	61%	60%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	44%	64%	28%	59%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	60%	83%	39%	79%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	57%	70%	56%	66%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	28%	20%	22%	23%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	20%	13%	31%	14%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:				
12.12	Resettlement day release?	60%	78%	50%	75%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	60%	73%	50%	72%
	Have you had access to the following:				
12.13	Resettlement day release?	56%	57%	39%	60%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	46%	48%	50%	48%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	28%	50%	24%	47%
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:				
12.14	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	19%	31%	28%	26%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	22%	34%	28%	30%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were closed conditions?	63%	74%	61%	71%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	25%	20%	24%	21%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	53%	65%	72%	61%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (age - over 50) HMP Hewell (open) 2012

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

Key to tables

		Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	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	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
Number of completed questionnaires returned							
1.5	Are you a foreign national?					0%	1%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?					91%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?					100%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?					17%	36%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?					8%	1%
1.1	Are you Muslim?					9%	12%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?					17%	8%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?					0%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?					70%	53%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?					91%	70%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?					83%	74%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?					91%	69%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?					91%	59%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?					33%	54%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?					61%	55%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?					91%	75%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?					100%	91%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?					61%	52%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?					100%	97%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?					33%	33%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?					30%	36%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?					41%	50%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?					70%	55%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?					76%	72%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?					78%	85%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?					30%	35%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	100%	79%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	91%	81%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	24%	14%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	82%	78%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	24%	22%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	18%	9%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	24%	11%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	18%	3%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	0%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	9%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	100%	100%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	0%	22%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	0%	10%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	3%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	50%	35%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	74%	61%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	76%	32%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	0%	3%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	50%	40%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	41%	60%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	41%	22%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	33%	33%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	9%	5%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	82%	67%
10.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	59%	61%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	82%	52%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	76%	75%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	82%	63%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	9%	25%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	9%	16%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
12.12	Resettlement day release?	80%	70%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	80%	66%
	Have you had access to the following:		
12.13	Resettlement day release?	55%	58%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	45%	48%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	45%	43%
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:		
12.14	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	18%	28%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	24%	30%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were closed conditions?	76%	69%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	18%	22%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	59%	61%