



**REPORT ON
A FULL ANNOUNCED
INSPECTION
OF
HM PRISON LITTLEHEY
2 – 6 DECEMBER 2002
BY
HM CHIEF INSPECTOR OF PRISONS**

Crown copyright 2003
ISBN ?
Printed and published by:
Home Office
50 Queen Anne's Gate
London
SW1H 9AT
England

INTRODUCTION

Littlehey was overall a good Category C training prison. It was characterised by very good staff-prisoner relationships, based upon respect and a real sense of equality, but within proper boundaries of control. At the time of the inspection, new staff attendance patterns had just been introduced, in the face of considerable resistance from staff. This had soured relationships with management, and there was an urgent need to bridge that gap and ensure that staff and managers were seen to be working together for the benefit of prisoners.

The core business of the prison - its work, training and education provision - was being pushed forward by a dynamic management team, committed to improving both the quantity and quality of work available. Some was already of high quality, but it needed to reach more prisoners and be more closely related to identified needs and sentence plans. Healthcare had improved significantly; but there was a clear need for more effective liaison and support from the NHS for those prisoners with acute and chronic mental health problems.

The prison was only starting to engage with the resettlement agenda, and this was an area in need of considerable development. There was no overall strategy, but rather a sense of competition between departments; and the prison needed to develop both its sentence planning and public protection work. Moreover, there was no effective work with those prisoners (about 20 a month) who would be released directly from the establishment. Almost a third of the prisoners in our survey said that they would be released within six months, and of those 43% had nowhere to live and 57% had no job; in very few cases had anyone spoken to them about these problems.

Littlehey, like the rest of the Category C estate, was suffering from the effects of prison overcrowding. It was receiving prisoners for shorter periods, further from their homes, and whose needs had not necessarily been assessed before they arrived there. Undoubtedly, the prison was having to deal with more demanding, and more vulnerable, prisoners than previously; and its training and resettlement work was therefore made more difficult. However, it had a very good basis on which to build,

and with continued effective management, can develop even more effective outcomes for prisoners.

Anne Owers
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

February 2003

CONTENTS

	Paragraph	Page
INTRODUCTION		3-4
FACT PAGE		8
HEALTHY PRISON SUMMARY		9-17
1 ARRIVAL IN CUSTODY		18-22
Reception	1.01-1.04	
First night	1.05-1.07	
Induction	1.08-1.20	
2 RESIDENTIAL UNITS		23-27
Accommodation and facilities	2.01-2.09	
Clothing and possessions	2.10-2.11	
Hygiene	2.12-2.18	
3 DUTY OF CARE		28-49
Anti-bullying	3.01-3.10	
Preventing self-harm and suicide	3.11-3.19	
Race relations and foreign nationals	3.20-3.29	
Substance use	3.30-3.57	
Maintaining contact with family and friends	3.58-3.79	
Applications, requests and complaints	3.80-3.84	
4 HEALTHCARE		50-61
Background	4.01-4.03	
Environment	4.04-4.10	
Staffing	4.11-4.15	
Delivery of care	4.16-4.55	
5 ACTIVITIES		62-75
Employment	5.01-5.09	
Education and work skills training	5.10-5.30	
Physical education	5.31-5.37	
Faith and religious activity	5.38-5.46	

	Paragraph	Page
Time out of cell	5.47-5.54	
6	GOOD ORDER	76-87
Rules of the prison	6.01-6.04	
Security	6.05-6.08	
Disciplinary procedures	6.09-6.13	
Use of force	6.14-6.16	
Segregation unit	6.17-6.31	
Incentives and earned privileges	6.32-6.39	
Treatment of vulnerable prisoners	6.40-6.41	
Categorisation	6.42-6.51	
7	RESETTLEMENT	88-99
Management of resettlement	7.01-7.04	
Re-integration planning	7.05-7.09	
Public Protection	7.10-7.12	
Sentence planning	7.13-7.18	
Offending behaviour work	7.19-7.34	
Key workers (Personal Officers)	7.35-7.40	
8	SERVICES	100- 104
Catering	8.01-8.10	
Prison shop	8.11-8.17	
9	LIFE SENTENCED PRISONERS	105- 107
10	RECOMMENDATIONS AND GOOD PRACTICE	108- 118
Main recommendations	10.01-10.06	
To the Area Manager	10.07	
To the Governor	10.08-10.71	
Examples of good practice	10.72-10.93	

APPENDICES

- I** Inspection team
- II** Population profile
- III** Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

FACT PAGE

Role of the establishment

Category C training prison delivering sex offender treatment programme (SOTP) and enhanced thinking skills (ETS) courses and holding up to 70 life sentenced prisoners.

Area organisation

Eastern (Area Manager Mike Spurr)

Number held

Average 650 in November 2002

Certified normal accommodation (CNA)

624

Operational capacity

666

Last inspection:

Short unannounced inspection, 6-8 December 1999

Brief history:

HMP Littlehey is a purpose built category C prison which opened in 1988 on the site of Gaynes Hall Youth Custody Centre.

Description of residential units:

A Wing – 118 prisoners in 112 cells, of which 6 are doubled. Holds majority of sex offenders and particularly vulnerable prisoners.

B Wing – 124 prisoners in 12 cells, of which 12 are doubled. Focus of drugs work and RAPT course.

C Wing - 124 prisoners in 12 cells, of which 12 are doubled. General wing.

D Wing - 124 prisoners in 12 cells, of which 12 are doubled. Prisoners on ETS course.

E Wing - 100 prisoners in 50 cells designed for 2 persons. Induction wing.

F Wing - 36 prisoners in 36 rooms/cells. Enhanced wing

G Wing - 40 prisoners in 40 rooms. Enhanced wing

HEALTHY PRISON SUMMARY

Introduction

HP.01 The concept of the healthy prison was introduced in our thematic review, *Suicide Is Everyone's Concern*, 1999. The four criteria for a healthy prison are:

- **Safety** – all prisoners are held in safety.
- **Respect** – prisoners are treated with respect as individuals.
- **Purposeful activity** – prisoners are fully and purposefully occupied.
- **Resettlement** – prisoners are prepared for their release and resettlement into the community with the aim of reducing the likelihood of their re-offending.

Safety

HP.02 Littlehey provided a relatively safe and orderly environment for prisoners. The only areas of weakness were some aspects of the reception process and the difficulties being experienced in B wing (see para 6.02).

HP.03 The reception building was clean and organised but provided a sterile environment. There was limited engagement between prison officers and prisoners. Little attention was given to prisoners' needs with staff attention being focused on the mechanics of the process.

HP.04 Prisoners new to Littlehey received high quality information on their first night, but this was delivered briskly in an environment which was not ideal. All prisoners undertook an induction programme which lasted two weeks. The programme itself was of a high quality, thorough and well tracked. All the prisoners to whom we spoke commended the programme.

HP.05 The segregation unit, known at Littlehey as the 'care and separation unit', was staffed by caring and efficient officers. Good systems were in place with prisoners being monitored closely and appropriate monthly reviews taking place. Adjudications were thorough and punishments were appropriate. During the adjudication process, the wider aspects of issues impacting upon prisoners' lives were taken into account

and prisoners were treated with respect. However, within the unit there was little activity for prisoners other than two half day sessions of education. The care and separation unit was also used to house some prisoners who were mentally ill and who were located inappropriately in a segregation unit in a category C prison. At the time of our inspection some prisoners were being held for reasons of good order and discipline in residential units; at times, some of these prisoners were not being given their basic entitlement to exercise and could spend up to 24 hours a day in their cells.

HP.06 An active suicide prevention and self-harm reduction committee was in place. A comprehensive policy had been produced and there was a high level of staff awareness of the procedures and of those prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm. A good Listener scheme was also in operation and reviews of those prisoners at risk of suicide were conducted thoroughly.

HP.07 The anti-bullying policy at Littlehey had recently been revised and was comprehensive and clear. The policy allowed for specific interventions to support victims and challenge perpetrators. There was also a 'buddy scheme' in operation, with 18 buddies in place at the time of our inspection, which encouraged identified and suitable prisoners to give support to those who were feeling vulnerable. In general, prisoners told us that they felt safe at Littlehey.

HP.08 Much of the good work in terms of maintaining a safe and orderly environment was underpinned by a management approach which linked key aspects of the safer custody agenda in effective ways.

Respect

HP.09 Littlehey provided a respectful environment based on positive staff/prisoner relationships which were underpinned by a sense of equality between prisoners and staff but which did not mitigate against staff maintaining control in the prison.

HP.10 Cells were generally clean, as were all other areas of the prison. Prisoners had good access to showers, baths and telephones and there was a weekly kit exchange. Staff demonstrated that they were keen to resolve problems that prisoners experienced and, in turn, prisoners respected them for this. Prisoners enjoyed acceptable amounts

of time out of cell, but difficulties in reconciling the roll at the two roll checks during the day were impinging on time out of cell and on the regime.

HP.11 Complaints were dealt with promptly and prisoners were given relevant and polite replies. Most complaints concerned property. The Prison Service's new complaints procedure was in place, and prisoners placed their complaint forms in boxes which were opened by the request/complaints clerk, thus ensuring confidentiality.

HP.12 Approximately 16 % of the population at Littlehey were from minority ethnic backgrounds, and there were 12 identified foreign national prisoners. Race relations at Littlehey had suffered from some transitional problems but at the time of this inspection a good race relations liaison officer was in post, there was good monitoring of statistics and an effective race relations management team. There were 11 race relations liaison prisoners on various wings throughout the prison; three of these prisoners also attended race relations team meetings. Prisoner representatives were provided with copies of racial complaint forms, which they could hand to other prisoners who might wish to make such complaints. Forty five complaints of a racial nature had been made during the first eleven months of 2002, and since July these complaints had all been investigated promptly.

HP.13 An effective chaplaincy team was well integrated into the management of the prison. Prisoners experienced no difficulty accessing services and the chaplaincy also managed the scheme for prison visitors, of whom there were 17 at the time of this inspection. The prison had a multi faith room and arrangements for Ramadan, which was taking place at the time of our inspection, were of a high quality.

HP.14 The incentives and earned privileges scheme was clear, effective and well managed. The scheme was also fair, and both prisoners and staff had a thorough understanding of it. It was, however, unimaginative; there was very little distinction between the three regime levels and prisoners were not allowed to have any property handed in.

HP.15 There had been very significant improvements in the provision of healthcare services to prisoners at Littlehey. Effective joint working with the local primary care trust and close links with the local hospital had resulted in benefits which included improved clinical supervision for nurses and the provision of important information for prisoners. There was also good and developing input from the local mental health trust. At the time of this inspection healthcare was a department in transition. There had been a change in role from type three to type two healthcare, a change in staff, and a change in staff attendance patterns. Despite this, some good initiatives were in place including chronic disease management, smoking cessation, sexual health clinics and the provision of a gay prisoners' coffee morning. There remained some confusion, however, as to whether healthcare services were to be provided on a seven day or five day basis and this issue needed to be resolved quickly.

HP.16 Overall, Littlehey provided a respectful, decent, caring and innovative environment supported by good systems providing good quality outcomes for prisoners.

Purposeful activity

HP.17 A wide range of work and training opportunities was available for prisoners at Littlehey, though not all prisoners were fully occupied in meaningful work.

HP.18 A dynamic management group had been driving forward improvements in the opportunities for work and training. Despite a good assessment of prisoners' needs at the end of the induction process, this did not always result in appropriate allocations of work. Waiting lists existed for employment places and some prisoners could wait up to eight weeks to take up a work or training vacancy. There were also wide disparities in pay, with the highest paid work opportunities being those requiring the least from prisoners in terms of skill; this disparity in pay was driving prisoners into work which was of benefit financially to the establishment, and to themselves, but which did not necessarily meet their identified sentence planning needs. Officially, there were 79 prisoners who were not employed, but this figure could be significantly increased as a result of daily closures of workshops. There remained a need to ensure that all prisoners were fully employed.

HP.19 Those prisoners undertaking education were generally well motivated and they were offered good teaching and opportunities for skill development. A good standard of work was produced by prisoners, although the curriculum was relatively limited. Quality assurance procedures in education and in training were poor.

HP.20 Littlehey provided some good opportunities for training but many opportunities for accrediting training were being missed. Some effective links had been established with industry, particularly in the light vehicle body repair workshop area. Aspects of health and safety within vocational training areas required improvement, and accommodation for the teaching of theory in engineering was very poor.

HP.21 There were very good relationships between prisoners and staff in the PE department. There were also good levels of achievement in the vocational courses offered, but these were of a limited range. PE instructors provided good teaching in these courses and actively engaged prisoners in their work. PE facilities themselves were used by only 55 % of the population and there remained a need to look more closely at the range of recreational programmes available in order to maximise uptake.

HP.22 The library was open at different times during the week but access was not well managed. The impact of the one evening per week lock up for each wing meant that on some occasions prisoners could be denied access to the library for a period of two weeks. There was also a need for greater liaison with the education department in order to ensure that a more appropriate stock of books was held.

HP.23 Overall, activity provision at Littlehey was adequate for the population but there remained a need to ensure that all prisoners were engaged in purposeful activity each day and that the activities on offer, and those undertaken by prisoners, were more closely linked with sentence planning.

Resettlement

HP.24 Resettlement was a relatively new area of work at Littlehey and it was one which required a broader vision, a clear strategy and closer co-operation between

those delivering outcomes for prisoners rather than the competition that was sometimes seen to be developing between them.

HP.25 A resettlement policy committee had recently been formed but no strategy was in place and there was no single vision of how to take the prison forward. Littlehey was releasing approximately 20 prisoners each month into the community, but no routine checks were undertaken prior to release to ensure that identified resettlement needs had been met.

HP.26 Sentence planning processes were of a high quality and sentence plans were closely monitored. At the time of this inspection approximately a quarter of the population had not had their sentence plans completed, but those which had been completed were of high quality. Some of the targets being set were poor, however, and sentence planning itself was not well linked to other activities in the prison. Essentially, the process of sentence planning at Littlehey was producing high quality documents rather than driving prisoners through their sentences.

HP.27 Littlehey held 65 life sentenced prisoners at the time of our inspection and their life sentence plans and reviews were being completed on time. However, these documents were not always as detailed as they should have been and comments from personal officers were frequently missing. The review we observed was of a high standard and life sentenced prisoners, particularly those in F and G wings, held staff in high regard. Unfortunately, this was not the case with all prisoners held outside F and G wings who considered that they were treated less favourably than others. Three 'lifer days' were offered each year; we spoke to some of the families who had attended one of them and their comments about staff were all positive.

HP.28 In our survey, 92 % of prisoners said they knew who their personal officers were, though only about half said that their personal officers went out of their way to make regular contact with them. Comments in prisoners' history sheets were of an acceptable quality and gave some indication of the kinds of problems and types of prisoners being dealt with. Relationships at a personal level between personal officers and prisoners were respectful, caring and impressive.

HP.29 Offending behaviour programme targets were being met in enhanced thinking skills and the sex offender treatment programme. There was, however, an inefficient system for referral and listing of prisoners. This, coupled with high prisoners' expectations and low staff awareness and ownership of offending behaviour programmes throughout the prison, led to some frustrations on the part of prisoners. There was a need to ensure more efficient systems for referral and shorter waiting lists for programmes.

HP.30 The visits environment was clean, comfortable and airy, and offered refreshment and crèche facilities. Unfortunately, some of the toilets for visitors were dirty. Relationships between staff and prisoners' families were good despite some visitors being unhappy about the amount of time they had to wait on stairs leading up to the visits room. A visitors centre was available outside the prison but this was too small to meet the demands placed upon it. Staff in the visitors centre provided a very good service, but there appeared to be a lack of recognition by the prison of the valuable service that was being made available.

HP.31 Public protection systems were in the process of development but were relatively weak. It was estimated that approximately 400 prisoners at Littlehey were sex offenders, taking into account either their index offence or previous convictions, but this was not a central area of concern within the prison. There was no clear mechanism to ensure appropriate assessment, with prisoners being referred to the public protection team on the basis of a general notion of "concern". The prison was linking with local multi agency public protection panels but the systems in place at Littlehey provided a safety net rather than a pro-active means of identifying and managing risk.

HP.32 Drugs work at Littlehey was generally of a high quality. There was a good rehabilitation programme based on the twelve step model and an effective multi-disciplinary CARAT service was also in place. A substance misuse group was working well and this focussed on raising awareness and improving prisoners' motivation. There were good links also with the healthcare centre. The prison was short of a drugs rehabilitation officer, a position for which it had received funding, and there was a need to increase the voluntary drug testing being undertaken.

Prisoners leaving Littlehey for post-release secondary treatment were offered good services, but there was a need within the prison to provide further group work for those prisoners completing the rehabilitation programme and having some while to wait until release. Mandatory drug testing figures were low at 3.7% but there was widely reported drug use in B wing which needed to be addressed.

HP.33 Some effective elements of a resettlement strategy were in place at Littlehey, but these needed to be clearer, more coherent and to form part of a strategy and development plan based on an accurate assessment of the population's needs.

Conclusion

HP.34 At the time of this inspection, Littlehey was in a period of transition: new staff attendance patterns had been introduced which removed the previous four day week and this had resulted in resistance from some staff. During our inspection we found some members of staff who were genuinely confused about the new working practices that had been introduced, but there were also some staff who were resistant to the new practices, and some staff who were actively colluding with prisoners in order to voice their dissatisfaction with the new systems.

HP.35 It is important that senior managers engage with staff in order to overcome the confusion that some share, and to address the obstructions that others may be placing in the way of the new systems operating effectively; these things will not simply happen over time, but will need careful management intervention.

HP.36 With continued effective management, Littlehey can develop further in terms of the outcomes it offers for prisoners and become even better than the good prison it is already.

Main recommendations

HP.37 The reception process should be reviewed to ensure it is focused on meeting the needs of prisoners new to the establishment.

HP.38 Mentally ill prisoners should not be held in the segregation (care and separation) unit.

HP.39 All prisoners should be engaged in meaningful work, training or education which should be linked to sentence plans.

HP.40 There should be a resettlement strategy for the prison, including an action plan for future development, which is monitored by the resettlement policy committee.

HP.41 Adequate and effective public protection systems should be in place.

HP.42 Electricity should be provided in all cells.

CHAPTER ONE

ARRIVAL IN CUSTODY

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for arrival in custody procedures (reception, first night and induction) are:

- **Safety:** Everything reasonable is done to help prisoners feel safe on their reception into prison; prisoners' needs are identified, including physical and mental healthcare, in order that they may be cared for and supported by competent trained staff
- **Respect:** The way in which entry procedures are conducted and the approach of competent staff preserves the personal identity of prisoners, respects their privacy and dignity and is responsive to their individual needs
- **Respect:** Prisoners are made aware of prison routines, how to access available services and cope with imprisonment
- **Purposeful activity:** Prisoners are constructively occupied during their first days in prison, preferably as part of a comprehensive induction programme
- **Resettlement and reducing re-offending:** Prisoners' welfare needs are identified and appropriate help offered to deal with them

Reception

1.01 The reception area provided sufficient offices, rooms and storerooms for its purpose as well as toilets for both staff and prisoners. All these areas were very clean and well maintained. The holding rooms were half glazed allowing good supervision, and each room contained a television and video as well as a notice board giving information on the prison's various policies. The office for conducting medical interviews afforded privacy for confidential discussions. Prisoners' stored property was kept in a locked, tidy storeroom which was well administered; all property was secured in labelled boxes.

1.02 Although the reception area was functional, it was austere and clinical. The notices were black and white, and the general atmosphere was not welcoming,

particularly as 42% of our survey respondents said they had spent two hours or longer in reception

1.03 We observed reception procedures taking place. All the documentation accompanying the prisoner was checked carefully. The prisoner was not offered a drink whilst in reception and he was left in a holding room without any staff contact or enquiries about his well-being until the reception procedure started. There was no explanation of the procedures and anyone not familiar with reception procedures would have been confused at the technical terminology used by the prison officers. The prisoner was required to sign a number of forms without proper explanation, and was given insufficient time to read and understand what he was signing. Conversations were limited to those that were strictly necessary and, in our view, the prisoner was not made to feel that he had arrived at a prison where prisoner needs would be assessed, addressed or taken seriously. Searching was done in private and with due regard to decency. The prisoner was issued with bedding and personal requisites.

1.04 At the end of the process, the prisoner we observed was asked if he needed to telephone anyone to let them know he was at Littlehey. However, our survey showed that 65% of prisoners were not given the opportunity to make a phone call on the day of reception. The prisoner was not given any detailed information about the prison but was told that this would be dealt with in the induction wing. A member of healthcare staff interviewed him before he was taken to the induction wing. The Prison Service cell sharing risk assessment form was completed. In our prisoners' survey, 43% of prisoners said they had been treated well or very well in reception, lower than the average for training prisons of 51%.

First Night

1.05 All prisoners arriving at Littlehey were located in E wing, the induction wing. They were taken to the television room in the wing where they could watch TV whilst waiting to be taken through first night procedures.

1.06 The first night procedures were completed in the senior officer's office, which was very busy with various members of staff coming in to ask questions or pick up

items and the telephone ringing almost constantly. The prisoner stood throughout the process, which was conducted briskly; the interchanges between the senior officer and prisoner did not encourage the prisoner to ask questions. This was not the result of the senior officer being unfriendly or unwilling, but was the effect of the pace of the interview and the busyness going on around them. Checks were made to ensure that the Prison Service cell sharing risk assessment form had been completed. Further checks on the prisoner's needs in relation to factors such as smoking and the prisoner's vulnerability were taken into account before he was allocated to a shared cell.

1.07 In our prisoner survey 78% of prisoners said they felt safe on their first night at Littlehey. An information and induction pack, which was available only in English, was issued to the prisoner. He was asked if he could read and was told to read all the contents carefully. The information pack contained details about mandatory drug testing, anti-bullying, suicide and self-harm prevention, and the Listeners scheme. It also contained a very detailed checklist for the officer who located him in his cell, to reinforce much of the information given at the interview. More information was given on the Listeners scheme and the prisoner was asked if he had any immediate problems. He was told he would be given a reception pack of toiletries, smoking material and sweets following this interview, and this duly happened. Finally, he was told the name of his personal officer and welcomed to the prison.

Induction

1.08 The induction programme was administered and delivered by dedicated prison officers who had been trained for this work. Induction was a modular, rolling programme so that prisoners could join it on the morning following their reception. According to our prisoners' survey, 83% had attended the induction programme. An initial interview was held to complete the administration and to check that the prisoner had settled into the wing. Any problems the prisoner might have were identified and either resolved immediately or referred onward.

1.09 Modules of the programme were usually delivered by a member of staff from the relevant department. The Listeners module was delivered in part by prisoners and

this had the added benefit of giving prisoners new to Littlehey an opportunity to ask questions they might otherwise not have asked a member of staff. The induction officer carefully tracked the prisoners' progress through the programme using a detailed chart which showed clearly which modules had been completed. The programme was comprehensive and equipped prisoners with the knowledge they required for life at Littlehey. The booklet that accompanied the programme, 'Showing prisoners the way', contained useful information that supported the various modules, but it was available only in English. Following the course there was no facility for prisoners to give their views on the content and quality of the induction programme.

1.10 A large sample of prisoners told inspectors that they had enjoyed the programme and thought it worthwhile. They all confirmed that they had completed all the modules. They praised the staff on the induction wing for their willingness to help and for their friendly and caring attitude.

1.11 For the two weeks prisoners were on the programme they were paid £4 a week. Afterwards, their pay would drop to the unemployed rate of £2.50 per week unless they had been allocated to work. Prisoners could expect to spend between eight to twelve weeks on the induction wing before being moved to one of the main wings.

Conclusion

1.12 Reception was clean and well looked after. The environment was austere and unwelcoming. The staff did little to settle any anxiety of someone new to the prison and did not engage in conversations to discover prisoner needs. The reception procedure was efficient but no explanation of what was happening took place. It was a process done to someone, not with him.

1.13 The first night procedures were conducted in an office inappropriate for the purpose. The interview was too brisk and did not allow or encourage the prisoner to ask questions. Despite this, and the fact that the prisoner was made to stand throughout, the staff displayed a willingness to ensure that the prisoner felt welcome

and his needs were met. The interview and information pack contained very useful information and advice.

1.14 The induction programme was comprehensive and equipped prisoners for their stay at Littlehey. The staff involved in the process ensured that it ran smoothly and that everyone completed all modules. The staff in the induction wing were helpful and caring.

Recommendations

1.15 **Staff should be trained and encouraged to engage actively with prisoners and to discover their immediate needs upon reception.**

1.16 **Reception procedures should be explained at each step in the process and time should be allowed for questions and clarification.**

1.17 **The reception environment should be improved to provide a friendly and welcoming atmosphere.**

1.18 **First night interviews should be conducted in a quiet and private environment in which prisoners are put at their ease and have time and opportunities to ask questions.**

1.19 **First night information and the booklet ‘Showing prisoners the way’ should be produced in languages other than English.**

1.20 **Feedback should be sought from prisoners on their experience and opinion of the induction programme.**

CHAPTER TWO

RESIDENTIAL UNITS

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for accommodation and facilities, clothing and possessions, and hygiene are:

- **Safety:** Prisoners live in a safe and hygienic environment
- **Safety:** Prisoners are risk and needs assessed before being placed with other prisoners in shared cells
- **Respect:** Prisoners have their dignity and privacy of life respected while in prison
- **Respect:** Prisoners are encouraged, enabled and expected to maintain an acceptable level of personal hygiene in appropriate, decent residential accommodation
- **Purposeful activity:** Suitable space and facilities on residential units are available and used to permit association activities that meet prisoners' needs

Accommodation and facilities

2.01 Prisoner accommodation was made up of seven separate residential wings. A to D wings were identical in design, each having 112 cells intended for single occupancy. In response to prison overcrowding, bunk beds had been put into 42 cells in these units to enable two prisoners to be held in each. Over the past year, the number of prisoners doubled up in this way had steadily increased from around 30 to nearer 70.

2.02 We saw a number of doubled cells and found them to be cramped. The toilet had been screened by means of a shower curtain which was probably the best arrangement given the limited space. We spoke to some prisoners who said they preferred sharing a cell and that they were satisfied with the doubled arrangements, providing they did not have to spend too much time locked in their cells.

2.03 Despite being purpose built, A to D wings were of a poor design. Cells were divided into four spurs located on two floors making supervision by staff difficult. The main staff office was located in the centre of the second floor and apart from times when cells had to be locked or unlocked, staff generally spent little time in the spurs. The servery and large association area were located in the centre of the first floor. C and D wing each had one spur designated as a ‘community wing.’ Providing a quieter and more self-contained environment for prisoners who had shown themselves to be responsible and trustworthy, this also gave prisoners an opportunity to progress within the regime other than by moving to F wing, which was not an option open to all.

2.04 E wing had been built some years after the main wings and was situated away from them. It was the induction wing, holding up to 100 prisoners in single cells being used as double cells, and held 87 prisoners at the time of our inspection. The wing was galleried with three landings and the layout made for good supervision.

2.05 All the cells in A to E wings had in-cell sanitation, a bed, table and chair, cupboard and a notice board. The cells we saw were kept clean and tidy, and we saw no graffiti or offensive displays. However, given the nature of the prisoner population at Littlehey, we were concerned that staff did not always seem alert to the appropriateness of material on display, and we found no evidence of censorship or monitoring of materials held by prisoners.

2.06 All cells had an in-cell emergency call bell linked to an audible alarm and displayed on a panel outside the main staff office. Our survey indicated that staff responded to 42% of calls within five minutes. We observed night duty staff respond immediately to call bells whilst calls made during the day appeared to be treated as less of a potential emergency.

2.07 Except for F wing, none of the cells had in-cell electricity. Prisoners could have battery-powered radios and they had access to a number of TV rooms during association periods. However these arrangements were not satisfactory and managers, staff and prisoners saw the installation of in-cell electricity as a major priority. When asked what they would most like to see changed at Littlehey, most respondents to our

survey put television and in-cell electricity top of the list. A 10.30 pm curfew was in operation after which time prisoners were expected to remain quiet and turn down their radios; on our tour of the prison between 9 and 10 pm. we found all wings to be calm and noise free with only occasional shouting from windows.

2.08 The association areas were well quipped with a range of well-maintained facilities such as snooker, table tennis, table football and darts. Due to problems in accessing the library (see section on library) several wings kept their own small supply of books. On some wings the large association area was also used for dining out although we were told the majority of prisoners chose to eat their meals in their cells. Each wing had a sufficient range of offices, interview rooms and storerooms.

2.09 F wing held 36 prisoners on two landings and provided what was described to us as a “super enhanced” regime. The wing generally provided better facilities, including in-cell electricity and courtesy locks to the cells, allowing prisoners more freedom of movement than elsewhere in the prison. F wing did not have in-cell sanitation but prisoners could leave their cell at any time to use the toilets. G wing had been added to the prison in 1997 and was a ‘ready to use’ unit providing single storey low security accommodation for 40 prisoners on the enhanced level regime..

Clothing and possessions

2.10 Prisoners could wear their own underwear, T-shirts and footwear (trainers); otherwise they had prison issue clothing. Clothing was generally clean but we saw several examples of ill-fitting clothes. Prisoners had to wear jeans in the wing and many of them told us they preferred track suit bottoms which were not available at this prison. Prison clothing and bedding was exchanged on a weekly basis. The prison used a personal kit bag system; dirty kit was left for collection by the clothing exchange store in the morning and clean replacements collected later that afternoon. The system worked well and inspectors had no complaints from prisoners about shortage of kit.

2.11 Only G wing had its own laundry; elsewhere the cleanliness of prisoners’ own clothes was their responsibility. In F wing, for example, prisoners could have a bucket in which to wash their clothes but prisoners in other wings had to use the

washbasin in their cells. This was unsatisfactory. Wings provided an iron and ironing board for prisoners' use.

Hygiene

2.12 Prisoners had good access to personal hygiene requisites as well as being able to purchase items from the prison shop. Staff in each wing issued items at least once a month and would supplement this on request. There were sufficient baths and showers to allow everyone access on a daily basis and prisoners could use the baths and showers whenever they were unlocked. In our prisoner survey, 80% said they had the opportunity to shower or bath more than five times a week. Prisoners' cells and in-cell toilets were kept clean; time was allowed to clean cells and cleaning materials were readily available.

Conclusion

2.13 With the exception of no in-cell electricity in most wings, the accommodation and facilities provided in the residential wings was of a good quality. Cells and communal areas were kept clean, tidy and free from graffiti. The layout of some wings hindered effective supervision by staff. The arrangements for fresh and regularly cleaned prison issue clothing were good but clothes were often ill-fitting. Without wing laundries, most prisoners had to wash their own clothes in cell sinks. Access to showers and baths was good.

Recommendations

2.14 **Prisoners in shared accommodation should receive maximum time out of cell.**

2.15 **An offensive display policy should be drawn up which includes, as part of the prison's public protection work, guidance on the appropriate use of censorship and monitoring of materials held by prisoners.**

2.16 **Better arrangements should be made for prisoners to wash and dry their clothing in the wing.**

2.17 **Prisoners should receive clothing of the right size.**

2.18 **Electricity should be provided in all cells.**

CHAPTER THREE

DUTY OF CARE

Anti-bullying

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for creating an environment safe from bullying are:

- **Safety:** Prisoners are as safe as possible from bullying behaviour, and bullied prisoners are always given full support in any bullying incident
- **Respect:** Neither staff nor prisoner uses their position or power to bully others
- **Respect:** Bullying and bullied prisoners are treated fairly and are aware of the systems that operate to prevent bullying behaviour
- **Purposeful activity:** Activities take place to develop self-esteem within an environment which discourages bullying and assists those who are or might be bullied
- **Resettlement and reducing re-offending:** Street and prison cultures are challenged through effective anti-bullying measures and programmes for all who are involved

Anti-Bullying

3.01 A major revision of the anti-bullying strategy during the previous 12 months had resulted in a clear and comprehensive approach to working with both bullies and victims. Whilst the strategy had not been fully implemented at the time of our inspection, several features were in place and from our discussions with staff and prisoners it was evident that there was a high awareness of anti-bullying issues and a commitment to providing a safe environment at Littlehey. This situation must have been due in part to the energy, vision and determination of the impressive anti-bullying co-ordinator. Staff and prisoners were honest and realistic in their assessment of the potential for bullying and of the levels of vulnerability amongst the prisoner population. However, the majority of prisoners to whom we spoke said that Littlehey was a safe prison. Sixty one per cent of respondents to our prisoner survey

said they had never felt unsafe; the figure at the time of our last inspection had been 51%.

3.02 The prison had conducted its own anti-bullying survey in June 2001 and this had informed the revision of the strategy. The intention was to repeat this exercise every two years. This survey had shown that 34% of prisoners who responded felt they had been bullied whilst at Littlehey and that incidents of bullying were most likely to occur whilst travelling around the prison, collecting medication and following the distribution of canteen. Consequently, these activities had been targeted for specific action, such as the introduction of a CCTV camera in the dispensary area. Our prisoner survey conducted in November 2002 showed that the percentage of prisoners who had been forced to hand over medication or canteen items had fallen since the time of our last inspection in 1999 from 14% to 3%. However, there had been increases in the percentage of prisoners who reported having been physically assaulted (from 5% in 1999 to 10% in 2002) and those who had been subject to insulting remarks (from 22% to 29%). Both these 2002 figures were higher than the relevant averages for training prisons.

3.03 The new arrangements for managing anti-bullying were characterised by greater managerial involvement and responsibility, and by proactive interventions by staff to challenge bullies and support victims. The anti-bullying committee and senior management team routinely considered a broad range of monitoring information that provided some indication of the 'health' of the prison. Good links had been established between anti-bullying and other areas as part of a co-ordinated approach to creating a safer prison. Sound systems, including use of the daily briefing sheet, existed to disseminate relevant information to staff about identified bullies and victims.

3.04 Two prisoners were subject to anti-bullying plans at the time of our inspection and we were impressed by the way in which they were being managed, monitored and reviewed; recording in the designated anti-bullying booklet was of a particularly high standard. It was not compulsory to set up a victim support plan; this was a decision for the relevant residential manager. Despite reference within the strategy to other departments providing input and support, direct work with bullies and victims

currently fell almost entirely to residential staff and was undertaken mainly on a one to one basis. Whilst this appeared to be working well, we felt the strategy would be enhanced by an increase in the range and type of programmes available.

3.05 The scheme identified five levels of intervention; the appropriate level was determined on an individual basis and had to be consistent with the level and nature of the threat that the bully represented to others. Only the deputy governor could authorise use of the most restrictive intervention, known as ‘restricted basic’. Nine prisoners had been placed on this regime in 2002, of whom seven had subsequently returned to normal location without any further problems. This information was provided to us as evidence of prison staff’s commitment and skills in working with difficult prisoners and the problems they presented.

3.06 Prisoners were given information about the anti-bullying strategy during reception and induction; staff in the induction unit, E wing, were particularly active in laying down ground rules in respect of acceptable and unacceptable behaviour. The strategy included an appeal process for prisoners but we were told that to date this had not been used. Indeed, based on the selection of anti-bullying booklets we read, once confronted with evidence or suspicion of inappropriate behaviour most prisoners had admitted responsibility and had sought to co-operate with staff.

3.07 A buddy scheme had been set up to provide support and advice to actual or potential victims of bullying. A team of 18 selected prisoners had received the same anti-bullying training as staff and met regularly with the anti-bullying co-ordinator. Buddies were located across the prison with at least two on each wing. As the scheme had been in operation for only a few weeks prior to our inspection, we could not assess or comment upon its effectiveness. We spoke to two buddies who were clear about the boundaries and responsibilities of their role and were enthusiastic about their task. Other prisoners to whom we spoke viewed the scheme with caution or suspicion, although the general conclusion was that anything that helped prisoners cope with prison life and improved prisoner safety was to be welcomed.

Conclusion

3.08 The revised anti-bullying scheme provided specific interventions both to challenge bullies and to support victims, giving anti-bullying a high profile. Requirements in terms of appropriate behaviour were clearly set out and inappropriate behaviour tackled fairly and openly. Policy and practice development was well co-ordinated with other areas within the safer custody agenda.

Recommendation

3.09 **The range of programmes available to support interventions with bullies and victims should be increased, particularly to address more entrenched attitudes or behaviour.**

Good Practice

3.10 *A buddy scheme had been set up to provide support and advice to actual or potential victims of bullying.*

Preventing self-harm and suicide

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for preventing self-harm and suicide are:

- **Safety:** Prisoners are held in an environment in which all reasonable steps are taken to protect prisoners from self-harm and suicide, honouring the prison's duty of care to every prisoner
- **Safety:** Significant information about individual prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide is communicated effectively by those who hold it to those who need it and integrated into the support plan
- **Respect:** Prisoners know where to find help and access it in times of crisis or need
- **Respect:** Raising and maintaining prisoners' self-esteem, especially in times of transition or change, should be inherent in the prison's culture, management, regimes and activity
- **Respect:** The treatment of those at risk of self-harm or suicide shall always maintain confidentiality, preserve or enhance the dignity of the prisoner and shall not itself be dehumanising

- **Purposeful activity:** Those prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide are encouraged to participate in appropriate purposeful activities, including specific programmes for their needs in this respect

3.11 The arrangements for the prevention and minimisation of suicide and self-harm were properly organised and operated well at Littlehey. A Prison Service investigation into the death in custody of a prisoner in October 2001 had produced several key recommendations based on findings of shortcomings in procedures. All the recommendations had been implemented and had resulted in a more focused and informed approach to self-harm; this extended to night staff whom we found to be well informed on procedures in the event of an emergency.

3.12 A policy statement on suicide and self-harm was supported operationally by a suicide prevention team (SPT) which met every three months and was chaired by the deputy governor. The SPT included representatives from departments across the prison and included the Samaritans and prisoner Listeners. Until recently, a member of the psychology department had audited the F2052SH forms every month and provided a written report for the SPT.

3.13 At the time of this inspection there were two prisoners identified as being at risk of self-harm and had open F2052SH forms which were properly completed and reviewed. We observed one of these reviews. In addition to the prisoner, the wing senior officer, a wing officer and a healthcare trained community psychiatric nurse were present. The prisoner was encouraged to participate in his review. Both of these prisoners were occupied during the day, one in full time education and the other employed in Workshop 6. Although their F2052SH forms did not accompany them off the wing, staff in their activity departments knew that they were identified as being at risk of self-harm

3.14 In the period April to September 2002 there had been 74 incidents of self-harm. The highest proportion of prisoners (21, or 28%) were in E wing, but A wing (15 prisoners, or 20%) and B wing (17 prisoners, or 23%) were also prominent. The new F213SH forms were coming into use in the prison and these forms were

completed when a prisoner deliberately harmed himself. These forms were not for use in cases of anorexia, bulimia nervosa, or food refusal; however, we came across three cases where F2052SH forms had been opened on prisoners who had refused food for a short period.

3.15 There was a thriving Listeners scheme with 11 Listeners located across most of the wings. In addition, a prisoner Listener co-ordinator arranged Listener rotas and liaised with a senior officer Listener manager. These administrative structures ensured a high profile for self-harm awareness. Listeners received training in 'first response' techniques, that is, what they should do if they found a prisoner harming himself and how to limit damage to that prisoner until staff arrived on the scene. There was no Listener in reception because, we were told, they could slow down the reception process if they talked to prisoners. If this were so, reception staff had little understanding of the use of Listeners.

3.16 The Samaritans visited the prison every Saturday morning when they also saw newly arrived prisoners in E wing. Listeners helped to deliver the induction module on self-harm. There were care suites in B and D wings; these were really two cells with no intervening wall that were occupied by two Listeners, with nothing else to make it more welcoming. A bid to fund care suites in A, C and E wings had been submitted.

Conclusion

3.17 The arrangements for the prevention and minimisation of suicide and self-harm were properly organised and operated well. Two prisoners identified as being at risk of self-harm had open F2052SH forms that were properly completed and reviewed. A thriving Listeners scheme was in operation with 11 Listeners located across most wings and care suites in B and D wings.

Recommendations

3.18 **The use of Listeners in reception should be encouraged.**

3.19 **Care suites should create an atmosphere in which prisoners at risk of self-harm feel able to relax.**

Race relations and foreign nationals

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for race relations are:

- **Safety:** Prisoners live in an environment in which they are safe from physical, verbal or emotional abuse, intimidation or victimisation or any discrimination on the grounds of race or culture
- **Respect:** Prisoners experience a culture that values diversity and actively promotes, maintains and monitors good practice in race relations
- **Respect:** Foreign nationals and those for whom English is not their first language are enabled to understand and communicate successfully
- **Respect:** Prisoners, regardless of their ethnic cultural background, have equal access to all appropriate facilities and activities within the establishment. Eligibility for benefits and privileges, for example risk assessments, are made without regard for race, ethnicity or culture
- **Purposeful activity:** Prisoners and staff are able to recognise and acknowledge the cultural diversity of the prison population

Race Relations

3.20 According to the race relations liaison officer (RRLO) and some of the minority ethnic prisoners to whom we spoke, the prison's commitment to race relations had improved in the latter half of 2002. This was attributed mainly to the leadership and support provided by the new deputy governor. Previously, the RRLO had not received the agreed facility time to undertake the role and at one stage had resigned from the post in protest. He confirmed that time was now being allocated to him. The RRLO brought to the post both a personal interest and breadth of experience, primarily in race relations but also in other equal opportunities issues.

3.21 As we found in other areas within Littlehey, good quality information was being routinely produced and analysed as part of the race relations strategy. We were told that 80% of the staff had attended race relations training in the previous three years. The race relations committee met regularly and had a wide representation, including the Board of Visitors and prisoners. The prison was experiencing difficulties in attracting representatives from external agencies to the committee.

Despite a low number of staff from minority ethnic groups, the profile met the target set by the Prison Service and reflected the local community, which was predominantly rural and, for the purposes of local recruitment, excluded the larger areas of population such as Cambridge, Bedford and Peterborough. At the time of our inspection, 16% of the prisoner population were from minority ethnic groups.

3.22 The RRLO was supported in his work by a group of 13 prisoners, 11 race relations representatives and two co-ordinators. This group held its own meetings and three representatives attended the race relations committee meetings. These prisoner representatives held copies of racial incident forms and prisoners were encouraged to discuss their concerns or complaints with a race relations representative to determine if it was appropriate and to access help and advice as necessary. We spoke to two representatives who said they felt they were making a worthwhile contribution which was valued by staff and prisoners.

3.23 We read the 45 racial incident forms that had been submitted during 2002. Four of these had resulted in governor's investigations. Incident forms had been submitted by a range of people across the prison, discipline and non-discipline staff and by prisoners other than the victim. This reflected both an awareness of the issues and an acceptance of responsibility. Since July 2002, all incident reports had resulted in a prompt investigation and response.

3.24 The RRLO and race relations committee also took responsibility for issues relating to the dozen or so foreign national prisoners held in Littlehey at any one time. No separate foreign nationals group had been set up, on the basis that there were rarely more than a few prisoners from the same country. Nevertheless, foreign national prisoners can have issues of common concern and interest and might benefit from an opportunity to meet together. We read entries in wing observation books which confirmed that foreign national prisoners received a short monthly telephone call at public expense. The RRLO maintained a list of prisoners and staff with foreign language skills and we were told that Language Line was used as necessary. However, we came across two examples of foreign prisoners, one on an adjudication and one identified as at risk of self-harm, where we did not feel that the prisoners were able to communicate in a way which enabled them to engage fully with staff.

3.25 To coincide with the Home Office multi-cultural awareness week, the prison had held its first ‘diversity day’ in October 2002. This event had been well received and the RRLO was hopeful that it could be repeated on at least an annual basis to build on the existing recognition and awareness of the cultural diversity within the prison. Displays of prisoner art work in communal areas reflected a range of influences and cultural backgrounds and prisoners of all recognised religions were encouraged and enabled to celebrate their religious festivals (see section on faith and religious activity.)

Conclusion

3.26 Despite earlier problems, related primarily to the allocation of time to the RRLO, Littlehey had good systems in place to identify and respond to incidents of racial discrimination. Those complaints we received from minority ethnic prisoners concerning access to facilities and activities did not differ from the complaints received from white prisoners. We had some concerns that the needs of foreign national prisoners, and especially those for whom English was not their first language, were not being met fully. Cultural and religious diversity appeared to be valued and promoted.

Recommendations

3.27 The prison should satisfy itself that it is meeting the needs of foreign national prisoners, in line with developing good practice within the Prison Service.

3.28 Non- or poor English speaking prisoners should be enabled to understand and to communicate effectively with staff

Good Practice

3.29 The RRLO was supported in his work by a group of 13 prisoners, 11 race relations representatives and two co-ordinators. These prisoner representatives held copies of racial incident forms and prisoners were encouraged to discuss their concerns or complaints with a race relations representative to determine if it was appropriate and to access help and advice as necessary.

Substance use

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes regarding substance use are:

- **Safety:** All prisoners are as safe as possible from exposure to and the effects of substance use while in custody
- **Respect:** Prisoners with substance related needs are identified at reception and throughout their time in custody
- **Purposeful activity:** All prisoners receive effective drug and alcohol education interventions to meet their needs
- **Resettlement and reducing re-offending:** Prisoners, according to their individually assessed needs, are provided with the necessary support and treatment both in prison and after release to maintain healthy lifestyles and avoid the harmful effects of drug use

3.30 Drug treatment provision was based in B wing and consisted of a rehabilitation programme, voluntary drug testing (VDT), a substance misuse programme, auricular acupuncture, and counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) services.

3.31 The CARAT services were provided by RAPT (the Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust) in partnership with the National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NACRO). The team consisted of a drug worker, a probation officer, a part-time NACRO worker and a CARAT prison liaison officer. The liaison officer post had recently been made full-time. A CARAT manager spent a third of her time with the team and helped with client work whilst a second drug worker post was currently vacant.

3.32 A full range of CARAT services was provided but, as was appropriate for a category C establishment, staff were particularly busy with re-assessments, care plan reviews and release planning. However, these activities were not included in CARAT key performance targets (KPTs) which measured only the number of initial assessments. We suggest that the KPTs for Littlehey should differ from those of CARAT services in local prisons to reflect the importance of throughcare and

resettlement work. This is a contract and monitoring issue which should be addressed at an area level.

3.33 In terms of resettlement work, the probation officer was able to complete community care assessments for prisoners wanting to access residential rehabilitation programmes on release and to undertake risk assessments for vulnerable prisoners. The NACRO worker focused on accommodation needs and accompanied prisoners on release to their chosen hostel or rehabilitation provider. Other team members had established good links with a wide range of community-based drug and alcohol agencies. We welcomed the team's emphasis on resettlement and consider their multi-disciplinary approach as an example of good practice.

3.34 CARAT staff ran a substance misuse programme of five days spread over two weeks. The programme aimed to increase participants' motivation for change and identified those requiring rehabilitation. Modules focused on education and advice on substance misuse and related life-style issues, and there was input from peer facilitators who had completed the rehabilitation programme and from specialist staff in healthcare, probation and psychology. Prisoners to whom we spoke had experienced the group as helpful in addressing their problematic substance use.

3.35 Following an individual needs assessment by the CARAT drug worker, those prisoners who required intensive intervention were referred to prison rehabilitation programmes.

3.36 RAPT ran a 12 step programme at the establishment for prisoners with severe substance misuse problems. Also known as the Minnesota model, it is an abstinence-based programme where addiction is seen as a life time illness which can be controlled but not cured. Prisoners for whom this programme was not suitable were referred to alternative drug treatment provision at other establishments. All too often, drug users are expected to fit into a particular model of treatment; we welcomed the practice at Littlehey of matching individuals' assessed need with rehabilitation provision either in-house or at another establishment.

3.37 RAPT's accredited, rolling rehabilitation programme started with a pre-admission part-time phase lasting up to eight weeks. Although this took place in B wing it was open to prisoners from other units. The primary treatment followed; this was a 12 week intensive full time programme during which participants needed to be housed in B wing. The treatment involved a mixture of group work, one to one counselling, lectures and written assignments. After successful completion a 12 week after care programme was available. Fewer prisoners than expected had started the primary programme in 2001-2, yet completion rates exceeded original targets; out of 43 who had begun primary treatment, 31 (72%) had managed to complete the programme.

3.38 The staff team consisted of a RAPT programme manager and three counsellors. Although funding was available for a dedicated prison officer for the programme this post was not filled. As a consequence, other staff undertook the task of voluntary drug testing which was essential to ensure programme compliance.

3.39 Prisoners spoke highly of the programme but felt that not enough was offered to "graduates" between completing the after care work shops and their release. They attended Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous meetings, and some worked as peer supporters; at the time of our visit there were four peer supporters. However, those prisoners completing the programme expressed a need for more structured support.

3.40 At the time of our inspection, referrals to the rehabilitation programme had dropped considerably and staff were recruiting prisoners from other establishments. CARAT staff confirmed that recently fewer prisoners with severe alcohol or drug problems had been coming to Littlehey. Our prisoner survey indicated a below average number of prisoners reporting drug problems, 28% as compared to 39% average for training prisons. The RAPT programme team wondered if this trend was related to a change in the prison's population: vulnerable prisoners seemed less likely to require intensive intervention for substance misuse problems. Referral criteria for admission to the rehabilitation programme were being clarified with healthcare staff. Meetings had been established to discuss prisoners' medical needs and the requirements of attending the RAPT course. Since 59% of prisoners in our

questionnaire sample said they were on prescribed medication, individual need should be balanced against the programme's philosophy of abstinence.

3.41 Recently, civilian and discipline staff had completed training in auricular (ear) acupuncture. This form of acupuncture had been developed specifically to help detoxify drug users, to reduce stress and improve sleeping patterns. The new service was available to CARAT and Rehabilitation Programme clients and had already proved popular with prisoners.

3.42 Since there was no longer 24 hour medical cover at Littlehey, healthcare did not offer detoxification. Most prisoners had already completed their detox at a prior establishment, and on the rare occasion when this was not the case the prisoner was transferred to a more suitable facility. A policy of not prescribing opiate based pain killers had been introduced since staff did not want to "promote a habit." Prisoners to whom we spoke supported this policy.

3.43 Hepatitis B vaccinations were offered at monthly drop-in clinics. The HIV support team from the Hinchingsbrooke Health Care Trust and the clinical nurse specialist from Addenbrooke's liver clinic provided in-reach services on a regular basis. Condoms were made available to prisoners on home leave and pre-release.

3.44 The prison failed to meet its voluntary drug testing (VDT) targets except for those on the RAPT course. Officers profiled for this task were diverted regularly to other duties. About a third of prisoners in the enhanced units were also on VDT compacts and there were plans to enable C, D and E wings to have better access to VDT. Also, the prison did not consistently meet its target for mandatory drug testing (MDT), especially at weekends. MDT staff were also regularly re-deployed. Positive MDT results ran well below target but it was thought that the test results did not reflect the level of drug availability in the prison.

3.45 B wing staff were frustrated that owing to overcrowding the VDT unit did not necessarily house prisoners who wanted to address their substance-related problems. This view was confirmed by prisoners to whom we spoke. At the time of our inspection there was particular concern about heroin "freebies" on offer and about

finds of “hooch” where intoxication had led to aggressive behaviour. The prison did use intelligence reports but these were not backed up by targeted testing. Other security measures included an active and a passive drug dog, searches and CCTV. There were plans for additional dogs and an extra dog handler.

3.46 The prison’s drug strategy team (DST) met every two months and had a multi-disciplinary membership which included representation from the local drug action team. We were encouraged by the emphasis placed on involving families and community-based providers in the care and rehabilitation of prisoners. Several staff had received training for working with families from ADFAM, a national charity supporting the families and friends of drug users; the local drug agencies provided outreach workers to give advice to families and CARAT staff regularly attended the visitors centre to build up relationships. The Eastern Region Families Partnership had just been launched to support families, and especially children, in maintaining regular contact with an imprisoned parent. Members of the DST maintained pro-active links with community agencies and initiatives.

Conclusion

3.47 A range of services delivered by multi-agency teams were in place to respond to the needs of prisoners with substance use problems. Unfortunately, not all of these were operating effectively: referrals to the rehabilitation programme were falling, the prison was not meeting its targets in respect of drug testing, and staff and prisoners were concerned that B wing was not able to function properly as a voluntary drug testing unit. We were pleased to see the emphasis being placed on resettlement and on the maintenance of appropriate links between the prison and the community.

Recommendations

3.48 **Key performance indicators for CARAT services in establishments such as Littlehey should differ from those of local prisons and reflect the importance of through care and resettlement work.**

3.49 **A dedicated officer should be made available to the RAPT programme, as specified in the contract, to meet the voluntary drug testing requirements.**

3.50 RAPT staff should consider running relapse prevention and pre-release groups for programme “graduates”.

3.51 The drug strategy team should monitor patterns of referrals to the RAPT programme and explore reasons behind any changes.

3.52 Voluntary drug testing should be promoted throughout the prison, and officers detailed for this task should be available.

Good Practice

3.53 *The CARAT team emphasised resettlement, and we saw their multi-disciplinary approach as an example of good practice.*

3.54 *Auricular acupuncture treatment was available to CARAT and rehabilitation programme clients.*

3.55 *Individuals’ assessed need was matched with rehabilitation provision in-house or at another establishment.*

3.56 *Seventy two per cent of prisoners attending RAPT’s rehabilitation programme completed it.*

3.57 *The drug strategy team involved families and community-based providers in the care and rehabilitation of prisoners with drug and alcohol problems.*

Maintaining contact with family and friends

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes on maintaining contact with family and friends are:

- **Safety:** Prisoners and visitors feel safe in their time together on visits and visitors feel safe within the establishment
- **Respect:** The rights of prisoners to maintain contact with family and friends are upheld and practical arrangements are in place to provide for their visitors, with special consideration being given to children and partners

- **Respect:** Visitors are welcome to the establishment, supported within the prison and recognised as free members of society in order that they may contribute positively to the prisoners' progress
- **Resettlement and reducing re-offending:** Prisoners are encouraged to build and maintain family and social networks and relationships that contribute to their well-being and help reintegrate them into the community

Mail

3.58 Before the revised staffing profiles had been introduced, prisoners' mail had been handled by wing staff. At the time of this inspection, the task had been given to a team of operational support grade (OSG) staff, three in the morning and two in the afternoon, and mail was sorted centrally. The OSG staff were not re-deployed to other duties but some staff were new. Both staff and prisoners attributed delays in receiving mail and in sending out visiting orders to the new system. Our survey results showed that 29% of prisoners experienced problems in sending and 39% in receiving mail; this compared to the averages for training prisons of 12% and 19%.

3.59 Even before the new system had been implemented, senior managers had recognised that delays were occurring in dealing with mail. Consequently the deputy governor had chaired a meeting two weeks before our inspection at which she met prisoner representatives from all wings to discuss improvements. The agenda included registered and recorded mail and visiting orders.

3.60 As a result of this meeting several changes were made to existing procedures. For example, prisoners would now sign for registered and recorded mail whilst waiting at the servery for lunch rather than the previous system which required individual prisoners to go to the wing office, as and when, to sign the receipt book. The previous system whereby prison staff filled out visiting orders would be replaced by a system operated at HMP Woodhill in which the prisoner completed an application form and his visitors would book a visit. It was hoped that this would reduce the volume of work in the mailroom and that staff would process incoming mail in time for it to reach the wings for collection by prisoners at 12.30pm rather than 11.30am. Although it was still too early to evaluate the effectiveness of these

changes, the new systems demonstrated a willingness on the part of senior managers to tackle sources of grievance.

Telephones

3.61 All wings contained an adequate number of telephones, the majority of which were located in an individual booth to provide maximum privacy. Prisoners could use the phones during association and recently a PIN number system had been introduced. We were impressed by the speed with which arrangements were made for prisoners to use the phones following reception; in some prisons this process can take several days. We received no complaints from prisoners about access to telephones although a quarter of prisoners responding to our survey said they had had problems accessing the phones.

Visits

3.62 Prisoners were entitled to two weekend and one weekday visit each month. Prisoners on the enhanced regime level were allowed an additional visit. Of the prisoners surveyed, 79% said they had received a visit whilst at Littlehey; however only just over one third of prisoners took their entitlement of three or more visits per month. Thirty-eight per cent received one visit per month or less.

3.63 Lasting for a maximum of two hours between 1.45 and 3.45pm, visits could be taken on Wednesdays, Thursdays, Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays. Though visits times were adhered to strictly, it was clear that there was room for individual discretion in terms of allowing prisoners additional visits; shortly before our inspection one prisoner had been allowed additional visits in place of his attendance at a funeral. Visits were adequately staffed by three OSGs and four officers, and good relationships existed between prison staff and visitors. In our survey 42% of prisoners felt staff treated their visitors well or very well, with 50% saying their visitors were treated neither well nor badly.

3.64 Visits could be booked by telephone but some visitors complained of difficulties in getting through to make a booking on the dedicated line. A bus service operated between the prison and Huntingdon railway station on Wednesdays and Saturdays for those visitors without their own transport. On arrival at the prison all

visitors were required to attend the visitors centre, located outside the prison, which opened officially at 12 o'clock. Many arrived early in order to be among the first group to move over to the prison when visits started; it was estimated that by so doing visitors could have a visit of between 20 and 40 minutes longer than those who were in the last group to go across. This system was encouraging visitors to arrive early and placing additional and excessive pressures on the volunteers working in the visitors centre.

3.65 The visitors centre was well furnished and comfortable and offered a wide range of information, refreshments, a television and a small crèche. However, the facility was far too small for the numbers using it: whereas the facility itself could comfortably house only about 50 people, on one recent weekday 97 adults and 18 children had been in the visitors centre; these numbers were not unusual. Lockers were provided for visitors to store property including cash that they would not be allowed to take into the prison. Unfortunately too few lockers were available. Volunteers within the visitors centre ensured that they spoke to all new visitors and provided them with information on the assisted prison visits scheme and other information that might be of interest to them. A drugs worker also visited weekly and mingled with visitors in the visitors centre offering advice and support where appropriate.

3.66 The management committee which ran the visitors centre received a grant from the prison but the volunteers involved in running the centre were largely responsible for the fundraising that enabled it to continue to operate. It was clear that those volunteers working in the visitors centre were providing a valuable service to the prison, to staff, and to prisoners, but they felt too detached from the operation of the prison and would have benefited from greater recognition of the service they were providing.

3.67 Once a group of visitors had been moved across to the prison they could spend a very considerable time waiting on the stairs to be moved into the visits hall, mainly as a result of delays in finding proof of identity for some visitors and in searching. This was the main area for complaint from visitors and they expressed it verbally and in the visitors centre comments book. Special arrangements were made for those

visitors who were disabled, and a chair-lift was in place to take them into the visits hall by a different route. The procedure for identification of visitors in the prison required one form of proof of identity following which visitors would have their hands stamped before they were allowed to meet their prisoner relatives or friends.

3.68 The searching of visitors was undertaken behind curtains and the standard of rub down searching was thorough. Children were always searched by female officers and all searching was conducted respectfully. One drug dog was available for use in visits. Visitors left the searching area and stood in a short line while the dog passed them; this process was conducted swiftly and sensitively. All staff were aware that an initial indication given by the drug dog may not be conclusive and there were clear instructions for staff who had concerns about visitors who might be bringing drugs into the prison.

3.69 The visits room was large, with 50 tables and clearly identified chairs for prisoners. The furniture was relatively comfortable with low tables provided. Visits numbers frequently reached the maximum of 48. On the occasions when we passed through the visits area staff were alert but not intrusive and their observations were aided by the use of closed circuit television.

3.70 Refreshments were offered throughout the visit by volunteers from the visitors centre. Some of these volunteers also staffed a crèche within the visits hall in which there were suitable toys and in which children were engagingly occupied. Toilets were provided at one end for prisoners and at the other end of the visiting hall for visitors; the female toilet was unacceptably dirty and had insufficient toilet paper.

3.71 Prisoners subject to closed visits were held in a corner of the visits room where their visits were conducted behind glass screens. The closed visits area was dilapidated and required more effective cleaning. It was also housed within a glass bubble which meant that visitors and prisoners on closed visits were easily identifiable to other prisoners and visitors in the room. This was unacceptable.

3.72 Legal visits took place every weekday morning from 9.30 to 11.30am. They were conducted in appropriate conditions that were in sight but out of hearing of

prison staff. Whilst legal visits were staffed by a dedicated group of prison officers from C wing, under the new working arrangements domestic visits were staffed by a floating group of prison officers who may not always have been familiar with the routines.

Conclusion

3.73 Prisoners' mail, previously the remit of wing staff, had been given to a team of OSGs in November 2002. Staff and prisoners attributed delays to receiving mail and sending visiting orders to this new system. Senior managers had attempted to resolve this by meeting prisoner representatives from all wings to discuss improvements.

3.74 The provision of telephones was good and enabled prisoners to make calls in privacy.

3.75 The experience for visitors and prisoners at Littlehey was a generally positive one: visits were held in a pleasant environment and relationships between staff, prisoners and visitors were cordial. There was a need for closed visits to be conducted out of sight of other prisoners and their visitors. The visitors centre, which provided a valuable service, would benefit from greater recognition by the prison of the quality of service it was providing.

Recommendations

3.76 Closed visits should be screened off so that visitors and prisoners are not visible to others in the visits hall.

3.77 There should be greater recognition by the prison of the work undertaken on their behalf by the visitors centre.

3.78 All areas of the visits hall, and in particular the toilets, should be thoroughly cleaned before visits take place.

Good Practice

3.79 *Prisoners could gain prompt access to the PIN phone system after reception*

Applications, requests and complaints

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for applications, requests and complaints are:

- **Safety:** Prisoners are safe from repercussions or recrimination in making any application or request or complaint
- **Respect:** Prisoners know and are given appropriate help to exercise their right of access both to applications, and requests and complaints; they receive a prompt, courteous and fair response from staff
- **Purposeful activity:** Applications are used to enable access to activities
- **Resettlement and reducing re-offending:** Sentence plans are normally implemented without a prisoner needing to use applications or request and complaints

3.80 An applications system operated on all wings whereby prisoners with particular requests filled out an application form every day. These forms were sifted by wing staff who passed on applications relating to other departments such as health care or probation. Most prisoners to whom we spoke said that wing applications were dealt with reasonably promptly.

3.81 The new request/complaints system was in operation at Littlehey. Sixty nine percent of respondents to our prisoner questionnaire said that it was easy to get a request/complaint form, which compared favourably with the average of 46% for training prisons. Forms were on display and easily available in the wings, with envelopes for prisoners requiring confidentiality for their forms. These forms were posted in yellow boxes in the wings which were opened by the request/complaints clerk. The forms were recorded in a register book before being processed as instructions stipulated; this minimised the complaints we often receive about staff intervening in the process.

3.82 We sampled some completed forms that had been returned to prisoners. The issues raised by prisoners were properly addressed and answers were politely phrased. Although there were few delays when responses were required from within the prison, this was not the case when forms were passed to Prison Service headquarters or

elsewhere. Most complaints were about property, although in October and November 2002 there had been many about mail. Prisoners told us that even when they complained nothing had been done. We felt that this accusation was directed towards establishment-wide deficiencies rather than the resolution of individual queries.

Conclusions

3.83 An effective system allowed prisoners to make wing applications and to take matters further through formal requests/complaints. The majority of complaints were about property but delays in mail had figured highly in recent months. The request/complaints clerk collected completed forms from the wings. Prompt replies were made to queries and answers were pertinent and polite.

Good Practice

3.84 *The request/complaints clerk opened the yellow boxes in the wings, in which request/complaint forms were posted.*

CHAPTER FOUR

HEALTHCARE

Expected outcomes

Inspectors will make judgements about healthcare against the following outcomes:

- Prisoners receive a full range of primary healthcare, health promotion and disease prevention services in an environment that is clean, safe and conforms with the standards that operate in the NHS
- NHS and prisoner records are available to those responsible for the care of the patient
- Prisoners receive healthcare from appropriately trained staff, and support and care in meeting their health needs from all prison staff. Their right to refuse treatment is recognised
- Prisoners with physical or mental health problems are identified and assessed promptly, receive appropriate treatment and care and, where appropriate, are referred without delay to appropriate secondary care providers
- Prisoners' access to health promotion in primary care is equivalent to that in the community
- Prisoners are encouraged to maintain healthy lifestyles while in prison and on release and are linked to community services, including GPs, prior to release
- Prisoners receive inpatient healthcare that meets NHS standards in an environment that is clean, safe and meets NHS standards
- Inpatients receive opportunities for purposeful, therapeutic occupation according to their assessed needs and care plan
- Patients requiring specialist healthcare are identified promptly and referred to visiting specialists or the NHS
- Continuity of treatment and care is not impeded by transfer between prison and the NHS or by inappropriate security precautions

Background

4.01 Prisoners should be cared for by a health service that:

- Assesses their need for healthcare and health promotion
- Meets the needs identified
- Links them with National Health Service (NHS) care on release and by doing so improves their health and reduces the risk of their re-offending

4.02 There has been a formal partnership between the prison and health services since April 2000. Each prison, with its local NHS partners, has been required to undertake a prison health needs assessment and agree a Prison Health Improvement Plan. Inspectors need to satisfy themselves that local partnership working is robust, effective and results in sustainable improvements in health and healthcare for prisoners.

Introduction

4.03 Healthcare at HMP Littlehey was at the end of a period of transition in both its function and staffing. The in-patient beds had been closed in April 2001 and services re-focused to provide prisoner-centred primary care. The principal officer (PO) post was replaced in January 2002 by an I grade nurse health care manager; this change had enabled the introduction of clinical leadership to the health care service. Further staff appointments and shift pattern changes had resulted in the development of nurse-led services and greater capacity for supporting prisoners with mental health problems. HMP Littlehey was rated as green under the 'traffic light' system.

Environment

4.04 Following its closure as a purpose-built in-patient facility, the healthcare centre (HCC) was undergoing refurbishment to allow for the development of a primary care service. It was located next to the main complex and could be accessed from ground level and off the first floor secure link between the main complex and residential wings A and B.

4.05 The ground floor had previously accommodated in-patients and cells were at various states of conversion to other use. We understood that conversion was only

partial in case the space was again needed for cells. Consequently some in-cell sanitation had been boxed in rather than removed. Similarly the sink area in the servery had been boxed in. This room was being refurbished as a clinic waiting room to replace the one which was currently situated in a cramped space under the stairs.

4.06 Also on the ground floor was the senior nurse's office, clinical rooms for the optician and physiotherapist, small consulting rooms and a gated cell. We understood the latter was due to be re-sited in the care and separation unit. Half of the ground floor had been taken over for use by the psychology department.

4.07 The upper floor was accessed by stairs from the ground floor at either end of the HCC as well as from the secure link. Immediately inside the gate was a medium sized waiting area which contained some wooden benches for prisoners to sit on. There was access to a clean ablution area and toilets. The waiting area had recently been painted and the boards with health promotion material had not yet been replaced. The space in the waiting room had been halved by the recent erection of double doors and a hatch. Beyond this first set of doors was the doctor's consulting room, which was connected to the main treatment room through a sliding glass hatch. Opposite this was a combined duty office, reception and dispensing room with a hatch which opened into the waiting area.

4.08 Through another set of double doors was the dental clinic and offices for the health care manager and typist. A locked gate separated these rooms from a staff training/resource room, and the pharmacy office and storeroom. Beyond a further gate were filing cabinets, a photocopier, a staff kitchen and toilets and stairs to the ground floor.

Records

4.09 All inmate medical records (IMRs) were stored alphabetically in a locked store room which was accessed through the duty office. Only health care staff could access this room. We sampled several sets of records, all of which had been completed correctly.

4.10 All prescription charts were stored in the dispensary and dental records were filed in the dental suite.

Staffing

4.11 There was a total of seven nurses: one I grade RGN health care manager, three F grades (two RGNs and one recently appointed RMN), and three E Grades (two RGNs, one recently appointed, and one RMN.) In addition there were two health care officers (HCOs). An E grade RMN agency nurse attended one day per week. The health care manager was a full member of the prison senior management team

4.12 The medical officer (MO) was a long term locum from South Africa, and had been working at Littlehey since June 2002. The MO's appointment had provided continuity and consistency of care that benefited patients and staff alike. He was clearly a committed member of the primary care team and helped to reinforce the 'responsible prisoner' approach of the nursing staff. Prisoners were made aware of what they could and could not expect in terms of prescribed medication. Although he was not General Practice Vocationally Trained he had primary care experience appropriate to his role in the prison.

4.13 An advertisement for a joint NHS/prison MO post had been drawn up with Huntingdon Primary Care Trust in response to the recommendations of the Doctors' Working Party¹. We understood that there had been minimal interest expressed in the post. On review, neither the advertisement nor the job description reflected the significant changes to practice that had taken place in the past year in HMP Littlehey.

4.14 A dentist provided 10 sessions a month, a physiotherapist two sessions per week, and an optician visited every 2 months. There was a full time senior pharmacy technician and a locum pharmacist visited 3 days a week. Visiting specialists included a consultant forensic psychiatrist and a forensic community psychiatric nurse who attended weekly, and a speech therapist who attended as required. There were also regular visits from the diabetic and HIV liaison nurses from the local hospital (Hinchingbrooke NHS Trust). Patients requiring other specialist medical care, such as

¹ Working Party Report into Doctors Working in the Prison Service, Department of Health 2001

genito-urinary medicine (GUM) or orthopaedic services, were seen in the hospital's out-patients department.

4.15 The healthcare centre was well served by two full time administrative staff who ensured that nursing staff could concentrate on the delivery of clinical care.

Delivery of Care

4.16 All new prisoners were seen on arrival in reception by a member of health care staff and given a basic health screen, the results of which were placed in the prisoner IMR. It was recognised that screening for mental illness was not robust. The MO reviewed all new prisoners during the primary care clinic the following day. We understood that when prisoners were admitted on Friday, the MO would see them the same day if possible.

4.17 Health care staff were on duty from 8am –8.30pm Monday to Friday and treatment time was from 11.30am –12.15pm. Generally, prisoners who were on a basic regime would attend at the beginning of the session and those at work attended on their way back to lunch from 11.55am. Patients wishing to collect medication reported to staff at the hatch to the dispensary. Those wanting to book appointments to see the doctor or other healthcare staff, or to report special sick, were seen at the other hatch next to the double doors. This hatch was also where patients could request “over the counter” type of medication, for example, for pain relief or indigestion.

4.18 The system seemed to be understood by prisoners waiting to be seen but appeared to be chaotic and did not allow for confidentiality or privacy. We understood that the signs had been removed whilst the waiting room was repainted. We also understood that the current arrangements, including the reduction in waiting space, were recent because discipline staff were no longer available to supervise waiting patients.

4.19 Patients would be seen outside treatment times if in urgent need or in an emergency. A local NHS practice provided out of hours cover which included telephone advice over the weekend. There were usually two staff on duty at

weekends, one for a full day and one on a half day. There had been occasions when the HCC had to close at the weekend because one of the two members of staff on duty was a HCO who was taken away from healthcare for discipline work elsewhere in the prison.

4.20 The MO held primary care clinics each morning, usually seeing between 10 and 12 patients, including those reporting special sick. In common with other prisons, he would visit prisoners in the care and separation unit each morning and also review those in cellular confinement. In the afternoon he did administration, saw reception/discharge patients and did minor surgery when required.

4.21 We were pleased that work had begun on a computerised chronic disease register. This allowed for easier targeting of specific patient groups for nurse-led clinics, for example, prisoners with coronary heart disease, asthma, diabetes mellitus and blood borne viruses. All prisoners aged over 65 years or with other risk factors had recently been offered and given influenza vaccination. Staff were planning to hold similar clinics to give meningitis C vaccinations to all under 24 years.

4.22 The development of effective health promotion clinics and the emphasis placed on prisoners taking responsibility for their own health was laudable. The smoking cessation groups had achieved a 46% success rate. The initiatives concerning sexual health and blood borne viruses were also impressive, particularly the establishment of a group to advise and support sexually active prisoners. This was facilitated by a nurse supported by a member of staff from the local trust. The nurse leading on sexual health had also established a hepatitis vaccination programme and developed innovative health promotion material. Hepatitis B vaccination was offered to all prisoners on reception (three injections over six months). Prisoners with HIV, hepatitis C and sexually transmitted diseases were referred to the local GUM clinic where treatment was started and monitored

4.23 The physiotherapist had been visiting the prison for the past four years. Prisoners wishing to see him were reviewed first by the MO who would refer them to the physiotherapist, or occasionally to gymnasium staff. The physiotherapist would see five to six clients per session, mostly for musculo-skeletal problems. He offered a

range of treatments including acupuncture, ultrasound, and interferential (nerve stimulation) treatment. He was planning to start modified mobility classes for clients suffering from acute and chronic back pain.

4.24 Healthcare staff regularly attended the prison's quarterly self-harm and suicide meetings.

4.25 There was evidence of very good joint working between the prison, the local PCT and the hospital. The PCT had included a feature on the prison and healthcare staff in its 2001/02 annual report. Prison staff were included in the PCT clinical governance arrangements and the PCT had provided a primary care clinical information system for use in the HCC. This would make information held in the HCC compatible with that in local primary care practices. Staff training was being undertaken and we understood that the system would be brought into use in early 2003. The governor chaired the prison health steering group.

Dental

4.26 The dentist visited the prison twice a week, seeing around 11 patients per day. He also provided services at three other prisons in the area (HMPs Whitemoor, Bedford and Highpoint). Planned treatments were provided in the morning session with new patients/relief of pain provided in the afternoon session. Prisoners wishing to see the dentist could self-refer and be put on the waiting list. Those needing emergency treatment between dental visits would be seen by the MO in the first instance. The dentist did not have a dental nurse assistant.

4.27 We were told that the waiting list was long, but on scrutiny it appeared that this was more administrative than real. Of the 90 names on the list there were 50 patients undergoing treatment and only 40 patients actually waiting to be seen. Nevertheless, the need for dentistry exceeded current provision, a situation which was exacerbated when clinics were cancelled due to prison 'lock down'. It was understood that extra sessions could be arranged when required.

4.28 The dental equipment was satisfactory. The potential for cross infection would be reduced by the provision of a new ceramic sink with a non-conducting work

surface. This would allow for instruments to be placed in the ultrasonic cleaner, rinsed and then put in the autoclave. One or more hospital type trolleys should be placed underneath the work surface for the storage of impression trays and other such items. Autoclave indicators were used in every cycle, which was an example of good practice.

Pharmaceutical

4.29 The prison had its own dispensing pharmacy and employed a part time pharmacist and a full time technician who held an accredited checker qualification. The service was well run and good practice and risk minimisation systems were evident. Mentoring links had been forged with the senior technician at Hinchingbrooke Hospital.

4.30 The pharmacy was open from 8.00am until 5.30pm. An out of hours emergency cupboard had been established and good audit systems were in place to monitor appropriate use. Clinical interventions were recorded in line with clinical governance requirements.

4.31 There was an in-possession policy whereby patients could have medication supplied to them on a daily, weekly or monthly basis. Insulin dependant diabetics had their insulin pens in possession. Domiciliary dosette boxes were made up for patients with particularly complicated drug treatments. Monthly in-possession medication supplied in Venalink packs were costly and took time to prepare. This practice should be reviewed and consideration given to supplying in the original manufacturer packs. In-possession treatments were dispensed to prisoners alphabetically on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays. A box was available in the waiting area for patients to submit requests for repeat prescriptions. A repeat prescription card had recently been introduced for prisoners' personal use, specifically to normalise the service. This was in line with community pharmacy systems and highlighted the proactive work of the pharmacy department

4.32 Prescriptions were hand written but we understood that electronic prescribing would be introduced once the new clinical information system was fully established.

Staff were working hard to prepare prescriptions and medication to ensure continuity of availability over the coming holiday period.

4.33 Treatment room cupboards were checked regularly by pharmacy staff for uncollected medication, details of which were recorded in a non-compliance book. This enabled nursing staff to make contact with non-compliant patients. Monthly colour coding was used on dispensed packs to facilitate checking.

4.34 An error log book had been adopted but needed to be improved to show more detail, in particular to enable an analysis of why the error had occurred and what steps had been taken to make sure that the error would not be repeated.

4.35 There was a limited special sick list available and proper records were kept at the time of supply. We considered that the special sick policy and list should be reviewed. There were only four items available, namely paradote tablets, soluble aspirin, menthol and eucalyptus inhalation and magnesium trisilicate mixture. The expertise of the pharmacist with regard to minor ailments was not being utilised. For example, Mycil powder (a treatment for athlete's foot) could be obtained only by visiting the doctor whereas in the community this could be obtained by visiting a pharmacy.

4.36 There was neither a drugs and therapeutic committee nor a practice formulary although initial contact had been established with the primary care trust pharmacy adviser.

Mental health

4.37 A significant number of prisoners suffered from severe mental illness. The level of in-house care had been increased by the appointment of an F grade RMN in May 2002. He had introduced care plans and worked closely with the forensic community psychiatric nurse (FCPN) who visited the prison once a week. The FCPN was part of a mental health in-reach team from the Parkhouse Clinic in Huntingdon, part of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mental Health Partnership Trust. He also provided clinical supervision to healthcare staff. The prison had entered a formal

arrangement with the trust for the provision of services for the financial year 2002/3 with an investment of £42k.

4.38 Prisoners could also be seen by a consultant forensic psychiatrist. Much of his work involved specialised risk assessments and discretionary lifer panel reports. Less time was available for regular review of inmates or arrangements for throughcare. The service was not multi-disciplinary. There was no general psychiatric care or occupational therapy and the clinical psychologist had been mainly involved with service planning rather than service delivery. There was also no day care service, which would be a desirable adjunct to primary mental health care.

4.39 Despite the good clinical relationships between the prison and trust staff, we were very concerned about the significant delays for transfer assessments for patients with severe mental illness. We recognised that there were bed pressures on the local medium secure unit and local psychiatric in-patient provision but felt the threshold for accepting prisoners was high. The problem was illustrated by the fact that two prisoners in the care and separation unit, placed there for disciplinary reasons, were nonetheless mentally ill and clearly in need of specialist NHS care. For the same reasons we were concerned about plans to relocate the gated cell in the HCC to the care and separation unit. Careful consideration needed to be given to the role of the cell before making a decision about its location.

4.40 We understood that the PCT had strategic plans to develop a pan-Cambridgeshire in-reach mental health team to serve both Littlehey and Whitemoor (and to include HMP Peterborough, when built) and to supplement the provision of the existing forensic services.

Conclusion

4.41 The quality of health care at HMP Littlehey had improved considerably since our last inspection. Staff were well motivated, enthusiastic and caring and consequently there were good patient/staff relationships. Prisoners had access to a wide range of primary care services including the recently introduced nurse led clinics. This good work now needed to be consolidated and built upon. The good relationships and joint working between the prison and its local health economy were

encouraging and bode well for the forthcoming changes in healthcare commissioning/provision.

Recommendations

4.42 The Regional Prison Health Development Team, PCT chief executive and governor should continue efforts to improve prisoner access to and support from mental health services within the local NHS mental health provision. This should include the establishment of a multi-disciplinary team including occupational therapy and psychology. If possible, mental health day services in the prison should be established.

4.43 The PCT chief executive, governor and head of healthcare should review the advertisement and job description for the medical officer post to reflect better both current practice and the requirements of the Doctors' Working Party Report.

4.44 The current initiatives should be sustained with the development of more nurse led clinics, more use of nurse triage, establishment of a pharmacy clinic and greater integration of healthcare across the whole prison.

4.45 The governor and head of healthcare should review weekend staffing levels. If a seven day service is desirable, weekend opening should not be compromised by the HCO on duty being removed for other duties.

4.46 The new location of the 'gated cell' should be determined according to its function.

4.47 A drugs and therapeutics committee should be established to review the in-possession and special sick policies, update the prescribing formulary, and introduce policies for patient group directives and medicines management.

4.48 Clinical supervision for all staff should be formalised with the PCT within the overall framework of clinical governance implementation.

4.49 The design and function of the new treatment/waiting area should be changed to enable patient confidentiality and privacy.

4.50 There should be a review of the dental waiting list in consultation with the practitioner. Extra clinical sessions should be offered to reduce the waiting list to a more acceptable level.

4.51 The prison should have a formal contractual arrangement with the dentist and a 'value for money' audit should be carried out annually to determine the cost effectiveness of the dental care provided.

Good practice

4.52 *The development of effective health promotion clinics and the emphasis placed on prisoners taking responsibility for their own health was laudable.*

4.53 *The initiatives around sexual health and blood borne viruses were also impressive, particularly the establishment of a group to advise and support sexually active prisoners.*

4.54 *Autoclave indicators were used in every cycle.*

4.55 *The introduction of repeat prescription cards for prisoners' personal use was in line with community pharmacy systems and highlighted the proactive work of the pharmacy department.*

CHAPTER FIVE

ACTIVITIES

Employment

The expected outcomes for prisoner employment are:

- **Safety:** Prisoners work in a safe, suitable environment
- **Respect:** The range, type and availability of work activity meets the needs of the prison population and prisoners are treated fairly in all aspects of their work, its allocation and pay
- **Purposeful activity:** Prisoners are engaged in well-organised employment; work programmes are integrated fully with residential units and other departments
- **Resettlement and reducing re-offending:** Prisoners are occupied in realistic work that prepares them for employment on release and helps to reduce re-offending

Management

5.01 The head of operations, regimes and security, who had been appointed in March 2002, was responsible for managing the education department, vocational training courses and the gymnasium. The head of works services and industries was responsible for employment in the kitchens, gardens and industries workshops, although he was on sick leave at the time of inspection. Both posts reported directly to the governor. Education was sub-contracted to a college of further education and the library sub-contracted to the county library services. Some of the industries workshops held external contracts.

5.02 Dynamic management had recently been driving improvements in education, vocational training and training for work. Significant funding had been secured to finance the changes identified as necessary to improve the activities regime. These included the provision of specialist horticulture facilities to introduce National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs) in the gardens; NVQ and assessor training for staff to introduce NVQs in the kitchen and staff mess; classrooms for the kitchen and

workshop areas and new specialist building training equipment. In addition, funding had been secured to create a new multi-purpose learning resource facility for the library with computers and supervised internet access.

5.03 Senior managers and the education manager were aware of the changes needed and had started to implement them. The need for better data to inform management decisions about qualification achievement had resulted in changes in the way information was collected since October 2002. In addition, senior managers had used the education department staff's knowledge of self-assessment to introduce a self-assessment process into the vocational training areas and physical education department in preparation for this inspection. However, the self-assessment had not included leadership and management issues.

5.04 Co-ordination across prison activities was ineffective and poor sentence planning contributed to the problems (see sections on sentence planning and personal officers.) Prisoners' education and training was being disrupted and prisoners were changed suddenly to treatment programmes, leaving vacancies unfilled. Figures provided to us showed that 60 prisoners were unassigned to work and 19 were unemployed. A further 28 prisoners were on the two week induction programme, 12 were unfit and 10 were pensioners. This meant that officially 20% of the prisoner population were not in work or training. However, on any day there were many more prisoners who remained in the residential wings, for example because of workshop staff absences. On some days during this inspection up to 40% of prisoners remained in their wings, unoccupied. Waiting lists for work places were mostly between one and eight weeks, although one workshop had a waiting period of 26 weeks.

5.05 Workshop activities, especially those with external contracts, offered higher rates of pay than education and training. Insufficient incentives were in place to encourage prisoners to choose education and training. Prisoners achieving qualifications from long programmes of study were given £10 bonuses on passing the awards. However, pay for attending full-time education had not increased since 1999 and was only £1 more than for part-time education. Information about prisoners' basic skills assessment results was not shared effectively with workshop staff and we

found examples of some prisoners who could not read well being allocated inappropriately to workshop duties that required reading instructions.

5.06 Quality assurance arrangements for education, vocational training and training for work were incomplete. The education department had good quality assurance arrangements, which were part of its parent college requirements. These included internal and external verification/moderation of assessments and learners' work for nationally recognised qualifications, systems for feedback from learners, and an annual self-assessment process. However, systems for managing both the education and the library sub-contracted provision were not sufficiently rigorous. Prison senior managers were not aware of the existence of some quality assurance documents that would have given them useful information. The workshops with external contracts had quality control procedures to ensure products met contract compliance standards. However, insufficient quality assurance arrangements were in place for vocational qualifications awarded in the workshops.

Work

5.07 The allocation of employment places at the time of the inspection was:

employment area	prisoner places
non-vocational training workshops	198
kitchen	20
general works party	9
inside gardening party	16
outside gardening party	4
cleaners and orderlies	84
total	331

5.08 Work on the outside gardening party and in the staff mess was available only to category D prisoners. Orderlies were located in areas such as the healthcare centre, reception, chapel, library, education, gymnasium and administration offices as well as in residential wings.

5.09 The industries workshops varied in the skill levels required, the repetitive nature of the work and the physical ability needed. The seven workshops offered a good range of choices for the varied prisoner population from basic assembly work, three contract services areas, two Braille workshops, craft and design to electronics work. In the electronics workshop the prisoners installed very specialised high-tech aids to everyday equipment for visually impaired people to create, for example, talking microwaves, tape measures and kettles. As these were exported throughout Europe the spoken language varied to suit the demands of the external contract. Nationally recognised qualifications were not available in the work areas, except basic food hygiene training for prisoners in food servery areas

Education and work skills training

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for education are:

- **Safety:** Prisoners receive education and work skills training in a safe, suitable environment in which they are enabled to participate fully
- **Respect:** Prisoners are offered opportunities in education and work skills training that meet their identified needs and different levels of ability, and promote and respect personal responsibility; education is facilitated and valued by the establishment and reflects a sensitivity to equality of opportunities issues
- **Purposeful activity:** Prisoners have the opportunity to engage in a range of education and work skills training that provides constructive and meaningful activity and potential for self-expression
- **Resettlement and reducing re-offending:** Prisoners are involved in education and work skills training specifically to enhance their employment opportunities

5.10 Education was provided through a contract with Matthew Boulton College, Birmingham. There were 16 part time session staff, two fractional posts, three full-time staff and one full time education manager. The department opened five days a week for 6½ hours a day. In addition, four subjects were offered on an unpaid, voluntary basis for 2½ hours on two evenings a week. The education department had stopped offering weekend classes. Of the prisoners who attended education, 63% were in classes for literacy, numeracy or English as a second or other language

(ESOL). Other subjects offered included art, pottery, sugarcraft, catering, motor mechanics awareness, computers, business studies and computerised accounting. Most education provision was on a full time basis, not allowing for an effective mix of education, training and work activities to meet prisoners' individual needs. Fifty prisoners were assigned to full time education, 14 to part time education and 13 to education/work job share. Forty per cent of the prisoners responding to our survey were or had been involved in some education or training compared to 26% in 1999; 88% of those attending education rated the provision as good or very good.

5.11 The prison education key performance targets for literacy and numeracy had been exceeded in the previous year. Since October 2002, the education department had started to collect data about the number of prisoners starting a qualification course each term, so that they would soon be able to calculate the achievement percentage rates for given periods of time. Systems were in place to record and monitor learner progress. The department had gained the Basic Skills Agency quality mark in February 2002. Basic skills were being introduced for prisoners in industries, delivered by education staff visiting the workshops. Education staff also visited the care and separation unit two days a week. The contracted college had implemented monitoring arrangements to ensure that the quality of education and training were focused upon the criteria agreed in the education services contract. There were good links between education staff in the prison and the main college site.

Work skills training

5.12 The four vocational training workshops employed the following numbers of prisoners:

training workshop	prisoner places
bricks	7
timber	23
light vehicle body repair	11
motor mechanics	12
total	53

5.13 The training was good and the prisoners were gaining relevant skills. As a result of effective links with industry, especially in the light vehicle body repair workshop, the prison had been given many modern and vintage cars, motorbikes, and modern industrial equipment, tools and materials. Industry assessors also visited the light vehicle body repair workshop to assess the standard of prisoners' skill for nationally recognised qualifications. This had resulted in successful prisoners being added to the industry's national lists for skilled employment upon release.

5.14 Senior managers had adjusted the work in the timber workshops to enable woodworking qualifications to take place. Innovative methods of accrediting prisoners' skills had been developed. This had allowed prisoners who were transferred early to gain nationally recognised units of qualifications during the course as well as enabling those prisoners who were able to stay for the full course to gain another nationally recognised award which required externally set and assessed examinations. However, there were concerns over the monitoring of assessments in the construction crafts workshops and about health and safety practices in the motor vehicles workshops.

5.15 In the gymnasium nine prisoners were taking a community sports leadership course and 17 a NVQ level 2 gym instructors course. Prisoners' qualification achievement in 2001-02 was good with 88% of course attendees gaining the gym instructors award and 68 % gaining the community sports leadership award. The teaching was good, although the range of vocational sports courses was small.

5.16 Our survey showed that 76% of prisoners had a job at Littlehey and almost two thirds of those without a job had applied for one. This reflected the prison's expectation and encouragement of all prisoners to take up employment or training opportunities. Whilst 45% of prisoners thought their work would give them skills and experience to help them get a job on release, a similar proportion (43%) did not believe it would.

Library

5.17 The library was situated adjacent to the education department and was contracted to Cambridgeshire County Library Services. The library opened for 20

hours per week for three evening and three weekday sessions, and for two hours on Saturday mornings. It was well laid out with desks and comfortable chairs for prisoners to work there. The library stocked a good range of books including legal reference materials, black and minority ethnic literature, basic skills and second language readers. Books in large print and spoken word tapes were also available. However there were no compact discs as the security department would not allow them; this was strange as prisoners were allowed to have CDs in their possession. Extra funding had been found to support prisoners who wished to audiotape stories for their children. There were very few vocational books in stock and insufficient links between library staff and teaching/training staff to help choose appropriate stocks.

5.18 The full time librarian told us that whilst the library suffered some book loss it was at a tolerable level. Generally prisoners appreciated the facility and looked after the books. Prisoners were not pressured to move quickly back to their wing and could browse at their leisure. Whenever we visited the library it was busy and the prisoners to whom we spoke told us that they enjoyed visiting but would have liked more western titles. The librarian was aware of this and had tried to get as many as possible.

5.19 A survey of all prisoners, conducted by the prison, had shown that approximately 25% used the library. Access was limited by wing and by regime restrictions both during the day for education class research purposes and for evening recreation and research reading. It was possible that prisoners would have to wait up to two weeks to visit the library in the evening because of the rota whereby one wing was locked up each evening. Access was also restricted when the librarian was absent. In our survey 27% of prisoners said they experienced problems accessing the library, compared to the training prison average of 17%.

Conclusion

5.20 Good senior managers had started to implement improvements to activities and significant funding had been acquired to support these. However, operational management lacked a cohesive approach and overall quality assurance arrangements were less than satisfactory. Equal opportunities were promoted effectively across the prison with a direct impact upon activities, but there was insufficient monitoring of

allocation from the activities waiting lists. Education, PE and most vocational training were good, although insufficient qualifications were offered in the PE department and workshops. Teaching was particularly good in the education and PE departments.

5.21 The library was run efficiently and prisoners' requests were catered for. A good range of books was available although more books to support the work being done in education would help prisoners on courses.

5.22 Our survey asked prisoners to list the three most positive things for them at Littlehey: their jobs and education courses were ranked first and third in the combined list.

Recommendations

A full account of the prison's strengths and weaknesses in these areas appears in the separate report prepared by the Adult Learning Inspectorate

5.23 Allocation to activities should be integrated into the sentence planning process.

5.24 Pay rates should be reviewed and the pay disincentive for prisoners to choose education and training removed.

5.25 The results of basic skills assessments should be shared with workshop staff.

5.26 Prisoners should be able to undertake a mix of education, training and work activities to meet their individual needs.

5.27 The library should stock books to support education courses.

5.28 The library should stock compact discs.

5.29 **Prisoner access to the library should be regular, predictable and not restricted unnecessarily.**

Good practice

5.30 *Effective links with industry had resulted in additional resources for the prison and improved opportunities for prisoners on release.*

Physical education

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for physical education are:

- **Safety:** Prisoners are safe during physical education activities
- **Respect:** The range, type and availability of physical education activities meet the needs of the prison population; prisoners are treated fairly in all aspects of physical education
- **Respect:** Physical education is part of the provision of a healthy lifestyle in promoting personal health, fitness and co-operative and team skills
- **Purposeful activity:** Prisoners are engaged in suitable physical education programmes that are fully integrated with other purposeful activities

5.31 The physical education (PE) department had one senior officer and three PE instructors (PEIs). The facilities were very good with a well-equipped weights area, a very large sports hall and a sports field that was used regularly. The showers were kept very clean, as were all areas, and prisoners were expected to shower after they had finished their session. There were excellent working relationships between PE staff and the prisoners. This was evident when we observed activities and saw the mutual respect between staff and prisoners. The staff supervised and taught prisoners in a friendly but professional way.

5.32 Before prisoners were allowed to use the gym they had to undertake an induction which included health and safety, conduct in the gym, reporting of accidents and cleanliness. At their induction they were told how to make an application to

attend the various activities. We received no complaints from prisoners about the fairness of the system or the number of sessions they could attend each week.

5.33 PE staff were aware of their responsibilities in implementing prison policies such as anti-bullying. The senior officer regularly briefed them to be aware of any behaviour that could indicate bullying amongst the prisoners. The PEIs spoke with knowledge when discussing this part of their work and were very keen that the gym was seen by all prisoners to be a safe place to visit. The PEIs also contributed to the drugs strategy by providing classes for those prisoners on the RAPT programme.

5.34 Morning sessions were allocated to vocational qualification courses (see section on work skills training.) The qualifications offered equipped prisoners for a career in the fitness industry; and the prison had been able to place some prisoners into work upon their release. Recreational PE activities took place on mid-week afternoons, evenings and at certain times at weekends, and consisted mainly of weights and games in the sports hall. However, an insufficient range of physical education and sports activities was on offer for older prisoners or those with physical disabilities.

5.35 Approximately 340 prisoners used the PE facility each week, indicating that about 55% of the prisoner population had regular PE exercise. Our prisoner survey showed that 43% of prisoners did not go to the gym; lack of interest was cited as the main reason for not using the PE facilities.

Conclusion

5.36 The PE department was run by keen and knowledgeable staff. The courses on offer were focused on enabling prisoners to gain employment on release. The recreational PE could have catered better for prisoners who were elderly or who were not particularly fit.

Recommendation

5.37 **A needs analysis should be carried out to determine the types of recreational activities which should be offered by the PE department.**

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for faith and religious activity are:

Safety: Prisoners can safely take part in spiritual activities

Respect: Prisoners of all faiths are able to practise their faith in suitable accommodation with sufficient appropriate facilities

Purposeful activity: Prisoners have ready access to a range of appropriate spiritual activities

Resettlement and reducing re-offending: Prisoners and groups of prisoners are able to be involved with their faith ministers from the community

5.38 The main declared religious denominations of the prisoner population were Church of England (30%), Roman Catholic (15%) and Muslim (7%). Other faiths were also represented to a lesser degree including Buddhists, Hindus, Sikhs and Jews.

5.39 The chaplaincy team, led by a Church of England chaplain, had nine part-time chaplains and lay visitors of many denominations. Recruitment of an assistant chaplain was underway, with the intention that this person would also oversee the 'Relationships and restorative justice' programmes run in conjunction with the prison fellowship, as well as having responsibility for pastoral throughcare of prisoners from the induction stage. Prisoners of other faiths were catered for by their own ministers; the most regular attendees were the Imam who took Friday services for Muslims and a Sikh minister who came every Sunday morning.

5.40 The chapel was spacious and provided an appropriate atmosphere for prayer and contemplation. A chapel orderly kept the area clean and a life sentenced prisoner was the chapel organist. The multi-faith room was a good sized room adjacent to the chaplaincy complex. This inspection took place during the month of Ramadan and the room was being used daily for Muslim prayer. Other faiths were meeting in the chaplaincy group room. However, the multi-faith room was being treated as a mosque by virtue of the posters on the walls and a notice that required all who entered the room to remove their shoes before proceeding further. If the volume of worshippers dictated a separate mosque then one should be provided. Until then the multi-faith room should provide a neutral environment for prayer and contemplation.

5.41 There were no problems in access to chapel and other faith services. Our survey showed that 73% of prisoners who wished to do so found it easy to attend a religious service. Chapel services were announced over the tannoy system and prisoners who wished to attend services made their way to the chapel. The integrated regime at Littlehey meant that separate services for vulnerable prisoners were not required. Prisoners in the care and separation unit could not attend chapel services if staff were not available to escort them and be present throughout the service; consequently these prisoners were seen separately if required.

5.42 The chaplaincy team was fully integrated into the work of the prison. Relationships between chaplaincy and wing staff were good. New reception prisoners were seen on Thursday mornings when the chaplaincy had a session in the induction programme. Bible study groups and discussion groups were available, and Quaker meetings were held every Friday evening. Muslim prisoners observing Ramadan were allowed, on request, to go on retreat and they were not required to work. The week of the inspection coincided with the Jewish festival of Chanukah and a Jewish minister took a service with three Jewish prisoners.

5.43 The chaplaincy department organised the prison visitors scheme. At the time of our inspection, 17 prisoners, including 12 lifers, were receiving such visits. These visits took place in the visits room, and prison visitors were treated no differently from other visitors.

Conclusion

5.44 The chaplaincy provision was well run. Non-Christian faiths were properly catered for but the multi-faith room was ostensibly a mosque. The integrated regime at Littlehey meant that vulnerable prisoners joined in chapel services with other prisoners. The prison visitor scheme worked well.

Recommendation

5.45 **The multi-faith room should provide a neutral environment.**

Good Practice

5.46 *Muslim prisoners observing Ramadan were allowed, on request, to go on retreat and they were not required to work.*

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for time out of cell, including hours unlocked, association and exercise, are:

Safety: Prisoners are safe when participating in out-of-cell activities

Respect: All prisoners have fair access to out-of-cell activities, opportunities for which meet the needs of the prison population

Purposeful activity: Varied and appropriate activities are supported by well-run wing routines and staff involvement

Prisoners' hours unlocked

5.47 Even though some prisoners were not in purposeful activity during the working day, we encountered few prisoners who were locked up as a consequence. For example, there were 21 elderly prisoners in A wing who were unlocked during the day and allowed out on the wing. Prisoners who worked off the wing, wing cleaners and servery workers spent nine hours out of cell but this was reduced for all prisoners at the weekend to six hours because there was no evening association. The exceptions to time out of cell during the week were prisoners in the care and separation unit and newly arrived prisoners in E wing. This last group spent more time locked up unless they were attending modules of the induction programme.

Association

5.48 Prior to the introduction of new shift patterns, prisoners had received evening association every weekday, but recently wings had been locked up in turn on one evening a week to allow evening association to take place on other wings. This did not happen every time; on one day when we observed evening association all prisoners had been unlocked for association. However, this disruption to prisoners' expectations of regular association was a significant cause for complaint by both prisoners and staff. The other cause for reduced association periods were prison roll

checks that seemed to take much longer than before and delayed the start of association.

Time in the open air – exercise

5.49 On weekdays prisoners who were unemployed, those on Basic regime and on wing duties received 40 minutes daily exercise prior to the midday meal. There was no equivalent for prisoners who went to work because this took them outside the residential area and into the fresh air. Prisoners attending education did not have to go outdoors for classes and therefore they had no outdoor exercise. At weekends there were two periods of association in the morning and early afternoon when prisoners could go outside.

5.50 Compared with the 67% national average for adult prisoners in similar establishments, our questionnaire found that 48% of prisoners at Littlehey received five or more periods of association each week. Similarly for exercise, compared with the 62% national average, 40% of Littlehey prisoners received five or more periods of exercise each week. Compared with the 74% national average 85% of Littlehey's prisoners received four or more hours out of cell on Saturdays and Sundays. Prisoners could choose to eat all their meals in association.

Conclusion

5.51 Most prisoners at Littlehey spent reasonable periods of time out of their cells. This did not extend to prisoners in E wing or those in the care and separation unit. There was no evening association at weekends and recent changes meant that one wing each evening had no association each weekday evening. Some prisoners had no exercise or time in the fresh air during the weekday.

Recommendations

5.52 **Prisoners in E wing should have more time out of cell.**

5.53 **Roll checks should be completed in time to allow full periods of association.**

5.54 **All prisoners should be offered daily exercise or association.**

CHAPTER SIX

GOOD ORDER

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for good order are:

- **Safety:** Prisoners' safety is protected by clear rules necessary for the maintenance of good order and discipline and enforced by the properly exercised authority of prison staff
- **Respect:** Prisoners understand the rules of the establishment and are treated fairly; they are able to appeal against decisions
- **Respect:** Segregation, the use of force and application of category and status are used for their proper purposes and not as punishments
- **Respect:** Every opportunity is taken to encourage good behaviour even when enforcing boundaries of control
- **Purposeful activity:** Good order is supported through activities for prisoners which are challenging and well-organised

Rules of the prison

6.01 Prisoners at Littlehey were aware of the rules that applied to them. Staff explained these rules during the induction programme and there were clear notices in all the wings in the prison.

6.02 In their dealings with prisoners, staff were always fair and courteous; prisoners commented on this to us and it was a hallmark of the nature of the relationship between staff and prisoners at Littlehey. Despite this, staff were prepared to challenge inappropriate conduct by prisoners and to explain why such conduct was unacceptable. In general, this led to the creation of a stable environment in the prison. The one exception was B wing, where prisoners and staff reported a high level of drug use and significant bullying. It appeared that this situation had been created by the unwillingness of some staff to challenge inappropriate behaviour of some prisoners. Senior managers were taking action at the time of our inspection to ensure that life for

prisoners in B wing was as free from intimidation and danger as life experienced by those held elsewhere in the prison.

6.03 Prisoners enjoyed considerable amounts of time out of their cell and in doing so were allowed opportunities to exercise personal responsibility in terms of managing those things they needed to do each day. Staff were keen to ensure responsible behaviour and also to ensure that prisoners attended for work when required to do so. At the time of this inspection, the prison was experiencing some difficulties in reconciling the prison roll during roll checks in the morning and afternoon, and this was affecting the punctuality of prisoner attendance at regime activities. It was not clear why these difficulties should have surfaced at this time, other than as part of the resistance by a minority of staff to the work systems which had been newly introduced.

6.04 During this inspection, we found no evidence of discriminatory practices being applied by staff to prisoners.

Security

6.05 In the month prior to our inspection a prisoner had escaped from Littlehey using a makeshift ladder to scale the perimeter fence near to a workshop. Despite this, in April 2002 the prison had achieved a 'good' rating from the Standards Audit Unit for all its security procedures and overall we were satisfied with the systems in place.

6.06 The elements of dynamic security were generally evident at Littlehey: there were very positive relationships between prisoners and staff, prisoners received personal and informed attention from staff, and most prisoners were engaged in constructive activity during each day. We also found security intelligence to be effectively managed.

6.07 In general, searching targets and cycles had been met prior to the introduction of new working systems approximately one month before this inspection. Since then, searching targets had fallen to approximately 50% as a result of the responsibility for searching being transferred to the operations group and those staff then being

transferred to other duties within the prison. There was a need to review this situation and ensure that searching targets were met consistently.

6.08 At the time of our inspection of the security department, the staff with whom we spoke left us with no confidence; it was our conclusion that they were either uninformed or disinterested in their task, or were being obstructive. This attitude and approach was not typical of that we experienced at Littlehey and it undermined the positive work undertaken by other staff and managers.

Disciplinary procedures

6.09 There were usually three or four adjudications each day. Numbers of adjudications varied in totals each month and in terms of distribution between wings as shown in the following table:

	A wing	B wing	C wing	D wing	E wing	F wing	G wing
Nov 02		12	9	4	7		
Oct 02		12	16		19		
Sep 02		24	27	24	18		
Aug 02	2	9	8	5	6		
July 02	4	7	9	11	9		

6.10 During the adjudication process prisoners were addressed as “Mr” and attempts were made to ensure that prisoners fully understood the procedure and the charges they faced. The adjudication process was also adjourned for prisoners who required more time to consider the charges against them and for those who wished to seek legal advice. Special arrangements, including the use of prisoner interpreters, were made for those who were not fluent in English.

6.11 The process itself was meticulous, clear, open and fair. In general, the proceedings were comprehensively recorded, though some adjudicators re-opening adjudications conducted by others found the writing of some governors to be illegible. Prisoners heard all the evidence presented against them, but where the reporting

officer was not present it was not always the case that prisoners were asked whether they would wish to question the reporting officer should he or she be available.

6.12 During the process it was clear that, in addition to meeting the requirements of the adjudication, staff were interested in and concerned with any problems which might have resulted in the behaviour for which charges had been laid. This holistic view of prisoners was commendable and contributed to ensuring that relatively few prisoners became locked into a cycle of poor behaviour and adjudications leading to confinement in the care and separation unit.

6.13 Findings of guilt at adjudications were based upon fair assessments of the evidence presented and the punishments awarded were also fair and consistent. It was clear from the punishment register that the dismissal of cases, the awarding of cautions and the suspension of awards were not infrequent.

Use of force

6.14 Control and restraint (C&R) techniques were used relatively infrequently at Littlehey. In the August preceding our visit they had been used twice, in September not at all and in October and November four times in each month. The reasons for employing C&R techniques varied, but on all occasions they were for serious incidents, in particular for fighting and assault; C&R techniques were also used in planned interventions where prisoners refused to move from particular locations. There was no part of the prison in which C&R was employed excessively, though it had been used more frequently in B wing in recent times as a result of some of the difficulties experienced in that wing, as discussed above. Documentation indicated that the use of C & R was always legitimate and as a last resort. Approved techniques were always used and were applied for a minimum period prior to return to normal location

6.15 Of approximately 140 staff eligible for training, around 80 members of staff were actually trained in basic C&R during the year. Civilian staff were offered breakaway training which took place during one week every year.

6.16 An inventory of C&R equipment was in the process of being placed on computer and was checked formally once a year. We were unable to find any member of staff who could remember the last time that a mechanical restraint such as a body belt had been used and there were no special cells at Littlehey.

Segregation unit

6.17 The segregation unit had been renamed the care and separation unit at Littlehey, though this was regarded by some staff with amusement. Despite this, the guiding principles employed by staff working in the unit were undoubtedly those of care and control. The unit was a L-shaped single storey building and was clean and in good decorative order. Prisoners' cells were also clean and there was no graffiti evident. The building consisted of nine cells with one cell used as a relocation cell, an appropriately furnished adjudication room, an office of a reasonable size, a servery and showering facilities. The unit had its own exercise yard.

6.18 Prisoners held in the unit were regularly monitored and entries in each prisoner's daily record painted a clear picture of their behaviour, though on some days no entries were made and on others the comments were somewhat bland. Prisoners spending more than a month in the unit were reviewed approximately every four weeks. The case reviews highlighted the most significant factors affecting the prisoners' behaviour and recommended what course of action should be followed. Unfortunately, some records of case reviews were unclear about who had attended and some provided no evidence of the prisoner being involved. Staff were keen to ensure that prisoners had active plans to return to normal location and these were the focus of case reviews, along with discussions that took place in adjudications and on visits by senior managers to the unit.

6.19 Prisoners received into the unit were searched in a holding cell following authorisation for their location being given by the duty governor or orderly officer. Authorisation for continued holding of prisoners in the unit was sanctioned by the Board of Visitors and all the records we examined were accurately completed to this effect. Prisoners were strip searched prior to location in their cells, though prisoners arriving for adjudication received only a rub down search. Prisoners being held in the care and separation unit were informed verbally of the reason they were located there

and issued with standard forms which were signed by a senior member of staff and indicated a review date.

6.20 Prisoners were visited on a daily basis by the duty governor, medical officer and chaplain, and these visits were all recorded in the unit diary. A member of the Board of Visitors visited the unit almost every day, which was commendable.

6.21 There was relatively little activity for prisoners held in the unit and no work was available; there was no access to general religious services and access to books was limited to those within the unit and on occasion those books not been changed for four to five months. Staff from the education department visited on Mondays and Wednesdays, but their involvement could be curtailed if lengthy adjudications meant that the adjudications room could not be used as a classroom.

6.22 The incentives and earned privileges scheme did not apply in the care and separation unit and the recording of prisoners being offered exercise was not always accurate. Prisoners were allowed daily access to the telephone, but we were told they were entitled to only one shower a week though they were encouraged to take more. Prisoners in the unit had visits along with other prisoners in the main visits room.

6.23 At the time of our inspection a number of prisoners were being held on good order and discipline (GOAD) in some of the residential units. There was a danger that these prisoners could be forgotten, and there was evidence that some of them had not always been given exercise which had resulted in them being locked in their cells for 24 hours a day on some occasions. It was explained to us that this was a temporary measure brought about by the need to establish order in B wing, but the situation required review in order to ensure that prisoners being held in this way were receiving their basic entitlements.

6.24 The relationship between staff and prisoners in Littlehey's care and separation unit was of a high quality, with staff focusing their attention on ensuring that prisoners were well controlled but also were treated fairly and decently during their stay there. This caring attitude and approach was particularly noticeable with regard to some of the prisoners who were evidently mentally ill (see section on healthcare). These

prisoners made considerable demands upon staff energy and time and they were clearly inappropriately located. The segregation unit of any category C prison is not a place for seriously mentally ill prisoners.

Conclusion

6.25 Prison rules were clearly stated and understood by staff and prisoners at Littlehey, and there was no discrimination in their application. Adjudications were conducted fairly and openly; punishments were also fairly and consistently awarded. Control and restraint techniques were employed infrequently, legitimately, and always as a last resort. Littlehey had renamed its segregation unit the care and separation unit and it operated in such a way as to justify the title. Prisoners in the unit were cared for and order was maintained. There was a relative lack of activity in the unit and some mentally ill patients were located there inappropriately.

Recommendations

6.26 **Prisoners in the care and separation unit should have access to purposeful activity.**

6.27 **Mentally ill prisoners should not be held in the care and separation unit at Littlehey.**

6.28 **Prisoners in the care and separation unit should receive daily showers.**

6.29 **Prisoners being held on good order and discipline in residential units should be given their basic entitlements.**

Good practice

6.30 *The holistic view of prisoners was commendable and contributed to ensuring that relatively few prisoners became locked into a cycle of poor behaviour and adjudications leading to confinement in the care and separation unit.*

6.31 *A member of the Board of Visitors visited the unit almost every day, which was commendable.*

Incentives and earned privileges

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for incentives and earned privileges are:

- **Respect:** Prisoners understand the rules of the establishment and are treated fairly; they are able to appeal against decisions
- **Respect:** Every opportunity is taken to encourage good behaviour even when enforcing boundaries of control

6.32 An incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was in operation. The policy document had been revised in June 2002 and was clear and easily understood; also it made clear that IEP played no part in the adjudication process. Both staff and prisoners understood the policy and it was clearly published throughout the prison. A residential governor was responsible for any issues that arose and for its future review.

6.33 The system was a three tiered regime: basic, standard and enhanced. Unless prisoners arrived at Littlehey on enhanced level regime, which they kept, they were initially placed on standard level. In order to move to enhanced level a prisoner had to have been at Littlehey for at least 28 days. Several forms had to be completed by the prisoner's personal officer, his work supervisor, security and the prisoner himself. A board was then convened and chaired by a principal officer. The prisoner and his personal officer were also expected to attend. The board considered all the written submissions, the personal officer's views, comments in the prisoner's history sheet and the prisoner's representations. The prisoner was told the decision of the board immediately and it was also confirmed in writing.

6.34 If a prisoner had three written warnings concerning bad or poor behaviour within a three month period a similar board was convened to consider if he should be downgraded. We examined many IEP files in all the main wings; the files were easily found and were neat and tidy. Boards had been convened properly and conducted in a fair and open manner. Prisoners confirmed that the system was fairly administered.

6.35 At the time of our inspection almost a quarter of the population were on enhanced level and only four prisoners on basic level. Those on basic level were managed in their wings and their status was reviewed every seven days against any short term targets that had been set to improve their behaviour. There was little difference between any of the regime levels; the most important differentials were the amount of private cash prisoners were allowed to spend and the number of visits they could have.

6.36 The main impediment to the scheme was the facilities list, which set out what items a prisoner could have and how he could acquire them. The list was not linked to the IEP scheme. Prisoners consistently complained that the range of items was restrictive and it was made difficult for them to acquire items. We examined the facilities list and were very surprised to find that only a St Christopher, Star of David, finger ring, guitar, recorder, photographs and prayer requisites could be handed in when family and friends visited. The same applied for items that could be posted in. The only real avenue for acquiring items was to buy them from the prison shop or through the approved mail order catalogue. As most prisoners earned very little and did not have cash of their own, the facilities list was indeed very restrictive.

Conclusion

6.37 The IEP scheme was clearly publicised and fairly administered. There was little difference between the regime levels and therefore little incentive to progress. The facilities list was not linked into the scheme and was far too restrictive both in content and particularly with regard to how items could be acquired.

Recommendations

6.38 **The facilities list should be linked to the IEP scheme.**

6.39 **The facilities list should be expanded and prisoners should be allowed to have most of the items handed or posted in.**

Treatment of Vulnerable Prisoners

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for vulnerable prisoners are:

Safety: Prisoners' safety is protected by clear rules necessary for the maintenance of good order and discipline, and enforced by the properly exercised authority of prison staff

Respect: Segregation, the use of force and application of category and status are used for their proper purposes and not as punishments

6.40 'A' wing held prisoners who were mainly convicted of sex offences or who were regarded as being vulnerable for other reasons, such as being unable to pay their debts to other prisoners. Certified normal accommodation was 120 and there were 118 prisoners on the wing on one day of the inspection. Many staff were trained in sex offender treatment programme (SOTP) awareness or were tutors for SOTP and enhanced thinking skills. Consequently staff in A wing were suitably informed about the kind of prisoners they had on the wing and what special measures had to be taken to monitor them.

Conclusion

6.41 There were no separate arrangements for prisoners in A wing and they were fully integrated into the regime of the prison and all its services

Categorisation

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for categorisation are:

- **Safety:** Prisoners are held in accommodation which is appropriate for their own and others' safety
- **Respect:** Prisoners are located in an establishment that is as close to home as possible and able to meet their identified needs
- **Respect:** Criteria for determining security categorisation and allocation procedures are clear, open and fair, and rules governing transfer arrangements are fairly and consistently applied without discrimination

- **Purposeful activity:** Security conditions do not unnecessarily restrict prisoners' access to purposeful activity

6.42 Apart from 17 category D prisoners, most of whom were located in F and G wings, the prisoners at Littlehey were category C. Owing to the prison's function only a small percentage of prisoners were close to their home area; the population profile at Appendix II shows the wide geographical spread of home areas, the largest number coming from London. Indeed, the prison could not provide details of home areas for the entire population; we were told this was due to variations in how such data is recorded in different prisons.

6.43 Although we found examples of security requirements restricting regime activities (see section on time out of cell), we found no evidence of such restrictions resulting from categorisation procedures. Once engaged in the drugs or accredited group work programmes, prisoners could be placed on hold to prevent them being transferred to another prison. We were told there had been no overcrowding drafts out of Littlehey during 2002.

6.44 Categorisation reviews were the responsibility of residential managers but were not taking place routinely. We were told that no formal structure was in place for re-categorisation reviews; they were held on an ad hoc basis, usually in response to a prisoner's application or, in the case of re-categorisation to category B, when the prisoner's behaviour triggered such a review. There was no link with sentence plan reviews or any other process related to the management of the prisoner's sentence, such as release on temporary licence.

6.45 Managers had recognised these deficiencies and we were told that plans were being developed to rectify them. We were aware of at least one prison within the same area that had developed a very robust approach to the range of sentence management reviews including re-categorisation and we suggest that any review of procedures at Littlehey would benefit from consideration of such established good practice.

6.46 The inadequate arrangements at the time of our inspection were a cause of concern to determinate sentenced prisoners who did not know when their next review would be held and therefore felt they were being prevented from progressing either within Littlehey or within the prison system. There was a feeling amongst staff and managers that the demands of prison overcrowding had almost totally removed the potential for planned progressive moves.

Conclusion

6.47 Categorisation reviews were taking place on an ad-hoc basis and were not linked into any other sentence management processes. Uncertainty over reviews and how to secure a move to category D conditions was a source of concern to prisoners. Managers readily acknowledged the inadequacy of current arrangements and were developing plans to introduce a more structured system.

Recommendations

6.48 Prison managers should be able to access up to date information about the home area of all prisoners currently held at Littlehey.

6.49 All prisoners should have their categorisation status reviewed regularly and particularly whenever there is a change in risk factors.

6.50 Re-categorisation and allocation decisions should be clear, open and fair.

6.51 Re-categorisation reviews should be integrated with sentence planning and other sentence management procedures.

CHAPTER SEVEN

RESETTLEMENT

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for resettlement are:

- **Safety:** Prisoners are able to trust staff to deal with details of their offending and personal circumstances responsibly
- **Respect:** Sentence planning, offending behaviour and substance use programmes and re-integration planning are effective and meet prisoners' assessed needs
- **Respect:** The approach of all staff encourages responsible behaviour and supports prisoners working on their offending, substance use and other problems and preparing for release
- **Purposeful activity:** Access and allocation to purposeful activity is linked to prisoners' assessed needs and their planned targets
- **Resettlement and reducing re-offending:** Prisoners address their offending behaviour and related problems and prepare for release while in custody

Management of resettlement

7.01 The resettlement policy committee (RPC) had replaced the former throughcare committee earlier in 2002 and had met on only three occasions before our inspection. The notes of the meetings reflected a broad agenda with a range of pertinent issues being considered. However, managers acknowledged that resettlement was a comparatively new area of work at Littlehey and they accepted our assessment that significant, sustained work was necessary to bring together all the elements required to offer a good, consistent resettlement service to all prisoners.

7.02 The deputy governor chaired the RPC and the role of head of resettlement had been allocated to one of the residential governors, in addition to his other tasks. Whilst the structure of the management team is a matter for the governor to determine, we believe that this arrangement might not give a high enough profile to resettlement, especially as the heads of activities and programmes were members of

the senior management team and had their own perspectives and priorities. We were also concerned that sufficient time and resources should be made available to take forward this important agenda within a realistic timescale.

7.03 The psychology department had completed a prisoner survey two years previously but there was no current analysis of the prisoner population and specifically prisoners' resettlement needs. Several managers and staff to whom we spoke could not describe, for example, the age or offence profile of the population or tell us how many prisoners were released from Littlehey each year. We were also aware of differing perceptions of what resettlement actually meant with managers and staff variously emphasising the primacy of education and skills training, accredited programme work or preparing prisoners for release in the final weeks of their sentence.

7.04 In the absence of a clear resettlement policy, staff and to some extent prisoners were able to perpetuate their own vision of what Littlehey should be offering to prisoners. At times of pressure and staff shortages as had been experienced at Littlehey, it was not surprising that departments within the prison looked primarily to their own needs and priorities and were prepared to defend their territory from actual or perceived threats. As a result, we heard a number of references to "empire building" by some departments. We were concerned that the various departments that would need to co-operate and work together to draw up and implement any resettlement strategy might be locked into more of a competitive approach which would be unhelpful.

Reintegration Planning

7.05 Managers had decided to stop running the inmate development pre-release programme (IDPR) in the summer of 2002 and many staff lamented the loss of this resource. A 30 week pilot resettlement project run earlier in the year had enabled a NACRO worker to see 49 prisoners within four weeks of their release date to give advice on accommodation, employment and finances. The project worker's end of project report concluded that 'Most [prisoners] have received very little advice on resettlement matters beyond their induction programme and at this stage of their sentence are very anxious about coping with life outside.'

7.06 We were told that a full time NACRO worker had been appointed to take forward similar work. Once in post the worker would be based in F wing and would have two trained life sentence prisoners to assist with the work. This was a welcome development. However, it was important that this resettlement post was not seen as the answer to all of the prison's resettlement problems and that as a result of the location this worker did not become, or be perceived to be, purely an F wing resource.

7.07 Fifty prisoners were due to be released from Littlehey in the 12 week period following our inspection. We were told that no routine checks would be made on these prisoners, no-one would necessarily contact them about their release arrangements and the prison did not hold discharge boards. Almost a third of the prisoners in our survey expected to be released within the next six months; of these, 43% said they had nowhere to live, 57% did not have a job and 65% expected to draw benefits. In only a small number of cases had anyone spoken to them about any of these issues.

7.08 Although the prison statistics showed that 2001 prisoners had been granted release on temporary licence (ROTL) in the period March 2001 to April 2002, this related predominantly to facility licence for category D prisoners to work outside the prison and to community visits for life sentence prisoners. We saw some evidence of temporary release being used as part of the preparation for release, for example to attend a hostel or interview, but this was not common and there was no formal system to identify and review suitable prisoners (see section on categorisation.)

7.09 In comparison, the arrangements for home detention curfew (HDC) were good. Eligible prisoners were given an appointment to see the HDC probation officer and we were told most prisoners kept this appointment. The HDC clerk sent relevant documentation to home probation areas in sufficient time to allow them one month to complete their enquiries; this had significantly increased the number of forms being returned and therefore probably improved the quality of decisions. The HDC board comprised staff who had had no previous involvement in the review process, thus providing a degree of independence. In the period January – October 2002, 78 prisoners had been considered for HDC and 30 (38%) had been released.

Public Protection

7.10 Staff agreed that a poor audit of their public protection work had been the main driver for creating the present arrangements. A range of documents covered public protection issues including a public protection policy, a multi agency public protection panel (MAPPP) interim agreement and a memorandum of understanding with Cambridgeshire Police and the national Probation Service (Cambridgeshire Area) concerning the release of dangerous prisoners. The public protection policy included the terms of reference for a public protection management team consisting of a governor, senior probation officer, senior psychologist and police liaison officer. The members met on a monthly basis and discussed specific prisoners and had contact with each other between meetings, but they did not physically work in the same part of the prison. Within the management structure, public protection was managed as part of the safer prisons agenda; it was our view that it should be a key element of a successful resettlement strategy.

7.11 It was clear that public protection work was at an early stage of development. Although the public protection team contained a core of expertise and appropriate documentation was in place, the prison had no structured approach to the identification of high risk of harm prisoners. Individual prisoners were referred to the team based on concern rather than systematic assessment. If members of the public protection team were absent or unavailable, high risk prisoners could easily be overlooked. We were concerned that the public protection policy seemed to accept and condone this lack of thoroughness by the inclusion of statements such as ‘There is always an element of non co-ordination or error’ and ‘There is always a chance that a proportion of potentially problematic prisoners can be missed.’ Just in the context of the substantial number of sex offenders serving their sentence at HMP Littlehey, let alone the potential risks presented by other prisoners, public protection work should have a higher profile in the prison with more robust procedures for identifying those at high risk of harming others.

7.12 There was evidence of a good link with MAPPPs mainly through the Senior Probation Officer. The prison supported the attendance of staff at MAPPPs or, if no one could attend, contributions were sent in writing. There was also evidence of assessing and managing risk by surveillance and intelligence gathering. Plans were in

place to have a public protection file situated in the probation office with an administrative member of staff maintaining the system. However, apart from those prisoners who attended accredited programmes, it was not clear how prison staff were working directly with prisoners to reduce their risk of harm while in custody,

Sentence Planning

7.13 The sentence management unit at Littlehey comprised one sentence planning clerk, located in a small office on one of the main administration corridors. All sentence planning files and documentation emanated from and were stored in this room. The clerk was both knowledgeable and efficient, having developed good systems for ensuring and monitoring the flow of work. Figures were readily available to inform us that 73% of sentence plans on determinate sentence prisoners had been completed.

7.14 Details of outstanding plans were recorded, including the name of the responsible personal officer, and this information passed regularly to residential wing managers for action. The clerk also recorded what stage had been reached in respect of each prisoner's sentence plan on the computerised prisoner database (LIDS) allowing other staff to access this information easily. Once completed, a copy of the sentence plan was sent to the home probation area even if no designated probation officer had been allocated at that stage. We considered all these procedures to be examples of good practice.

7.15 We were told that although most prisoners would have been in at least one other prison, 59% of prisoners who should have had a current sentence plan arrived at Littlehey without one. The intention was that initial sentence plans or reviews should be completed by staff in E wing prior to the prisoner being transferred to another unit. We sampled 15 completed sentence plans and found that they were generally well completed with a lot of detail about the prisoner. We were pleased to see that wing staff referred to previous convictions, pre-sentence reports and any other available material when preparing the plan. The plan was discussed with the prisoner and he could obtain access to it at any time by application. The quality of all completed plans was quality checked by a principal officer and the plan stamped to indicate that this had been done. Of the prisoners we surveyed, almost three quarters said they had

a sentence plan; of these 96% knew what their targets were and 87% agreed with those targets. However, only 42% of prisoners felt their targets could be met at Littlehey, less than the 60% average for training prisons.

7.16 Whilst the content of sentence plans was good, the quality of targets was poor and usually identified one of the programmes available at Littlehey and other targets relating to conduct and behaviour whilst in prison. Most targets were not specific or time bound. We spoke to a number of staff who were responsible for writing sentence plans; most had received no formal training and had learned what skills they had from working alongside colleagues on the wing. The RPC had recognised the need for staff training in setting targets. Up to date information on such matters as what resources were available within the prison, eligibility criteria and commencements dates of programmes might also help produce more specific and realistic sentence plan targets.

7.17 Given the nature of the risks presented by many prisoners at Littlehey, it was particularly important that prisoners were set targets that were challenging and which covered the period after release as well as in prison. Under the present arrangements it was all too easy for prisoners to achieve their sentence planning targets readily or to argue that they had been prevented from so doing by factors outside their control. This made subsequent assessment of their commitment, progress and the reduction of identified risks more difficult.

7.18 Whilst a lot of energy and effort was going into completing the documentation, plans generally then rested in the sentence management unit file. The sentence planning process was not used to co-ordinate or inform other decisions about the prisoner and it did not necessarily determine what happened to a prisoner whilst at Littlehey.

Offending Behaviour Work

7.19 Littlehey ran the enhanced thinking skills programme (ETS) and core sex offender treatment programme (SOTP) with a combination of psychology and discipline staff tutors. The first booster SOTP programme had started in October 2002 with six prisoners attending. It was desirable that sex offenders completed the ETS programme prior to the SOTP so some of the 70 places currently available on

ETS each year were allocated for this purpose. Targets for the number of groups provided in 2003/4 had increased to ten ETS and five SOTP but the achievement of this would depend on the availability of trained staff and, in the case of SOTP, on suitable prisoner candidates.

7.20 The prison had achieved a quality rating of 100% for ETS and 90% for SOTP when audited by the Offending Behaviour Unit for the year 2001/02, reflecting a high quality of delivery and achievement of most performance standards. Dedicated and appropriate accommodation was provided for SOTP in A wing and for ETS in D wing. Although awareness training in relation to both programmes had been provided for staff, attendance was not compulsory and programme staff were not satisfied that sufficient residential staff and personal officers had received the training. This contrasted with high levels of attendance at race relations, suicide awareness and anti-bullying training which evidently had received more attention as part of the Safer Prisons strategy.

7.21 As with other departments within the prison, we were told that staff shortages and other pressures during the previous year had impacted upon the unit's effectiveness. For the two months prior to our inspection the psychology department had not been able to complete any assessments for ETS, although it was planned to resume this task in the New Year. This had increased the backlog of work and although exact figures could not be provided, staff estimated that some 100 prisoners were either awaiting assessment for ETS or had been assessed and were waiting for a place on a course. In contrast, only 12 prisoners were waiting for the SOTP and a further nine had expressed an interest in being assessed for the programme. Suitable prisoners were allocated a place on a course based on their non-parole date rather than their earliest possible release date. From our first meeting with prisoner groups at the start of our inspection, the issue of waiting lists for programmes was raised frequently by prisoners. Some prisoners could expect to wait over 12 months to attend an ETS programme; hence it was likely that many would have been transferred or discharged from Littlehey before a place on a programme became available. This was a source of real tension within the prison and of real pressure on the psychology department.

7.22 It was our view that the expectations of prisoners were being raised unnecessarily in respect of access to programmes. A clear resettlement strategy could include a prioritisation for programmes and provide alternatives for those prisoners who could not realistically expect to complete a programme prior to release or transfer. Some initial screening, especially for ETS, could take place at the sentence planning stage and remove the necessity for all prisoners to go on a waiting list simply to access another waiting list. The sentence planning process should also determine which prisoners are referred for assessment; at present, prisoners could do this independently by making an application direct to psychology.

Conclusion

7.23 Resettlement was described to us as a ‘new area’ for Littlehey. Whilst some aspects of the work were being completed efficiently at an operational level, there was a need for a strategic lead and for the various strands of policy and activity to be brought together and co-ordinated. The prison had already shown itself capable of managing the Safer Prison’s agenda in this way. All staff within the prison needed to be clear about the nature of the prisoner population with which they were dealing and the priorities for Littlehey in the assessment and management of those prisoners. The arrangements for sentence planning and public protection needed particular attention to ensure that they became central functions rather than desirable add –on activities.

Recommendations

7.24 Littlehey should develop a clear resettlement policy or policies for the whole establishment based on an up to date analysis of the resettlement needs of the prisoner population.

7.25 Access and allocation to purposeful activity and offending behaviour programmes should be linked to prisoners’ assessed needs and their sentence plan targets.

7.26 Prisoners should be helped to prepare for their release in adequate time to allow appropriate arrangements to be made and for outstanding matters of concern to be dealt with.

7.27 Robust, routine arrangements should be introduced to assess the risk of harm presented by each prisoner and to identify quickly those to whom public protection or dangerous offender procedures applied.

7.28 Sentence plan targets should be challenging, realistic and address resettlement objectives as well as the prisoner's purposeful use of time at Littlehey.

7.29 Sentence plans should inform all decisions relevant to the prisoner's resettlement.

7.30 The system for assessment and referral of prisoners to offending behaviour programmes should be reviewed so that all prisoners have a realistic chance of completing identified courses before their earliest date of release.

Good Practice

7.31 *The HDC clerk sent relevant documentation to home probation areas in sufficient time to allow them one month to complete their enquiries; this had significantly increased the number of forms being returned and hence probably improved the quality of decisions.*

7.32 *Details of outstanding sentence plans were recorded, including the name of the responsible personal officer, and this information passed regularly to residential wing managers for action.*

7.33 *The sentence planning clerk recorded what stage had been reached in respect of each prisoner's sentence plan on the computerised prisoner database (LIDS) allowing other staff to easily access this information.*

7.34 *Once completed, a copy of the sentence plan was sent to the home probation area even if no designated probation officer had been allocated at that stage.*

Key workers (personal officers)

Expected outcomes

The expected outcome for key workers are:

- **Safety:** Key workers provide a first line level of care promoting safety in the prison environment
- **Respect:** Prisoners experience relationships with their key workers that are based on mutual respect, high expectations and affirmation
- **Respect:** Prisoners know that their key worker will support them fully in their involvement in the prison system and throughout the progress of their sentence, based on sound knowledge of the prisoner, including any special needs
- **Purposeful activity:** Key workers encourage the best use of their prisoners' time out of cell
- **Resettlement and reducing re-offending:** Key workers ensure that prisoners start and maintain the process of resettlement from the beginning of the sentence and in each new location

7.35 Each residential officer was responsible for the prisoners located in a number of designated cells, normally eight to ten prisoners. Some staff specialised in work with life sentenced prisoners. As a prisoner's personal officer, the member of staff was expected to act as the first point of contact for the prisoner and to make regular entries in the prisoner's file to inform decisions about the prisoner such as incentives and earned privileges reviews. The personal officer also played an important role in preparing or contributing to sentence plans and ensuring sentence plan targets were progressed. We were given anecdotal evidence of some personal officers being involved in the management of public protection cases, including some instances of representing the prison at Multi Agency Public Protection Panels held in the community.

7.36 Based on the results of our survey and discussions with prisoners throughout the inspection, we were confident that most prisoners had an identified personal officer and knew who that officer was; 92% of respondents to our prisoner survey said they had a personal officer compared with the training prison average of 75%. However, only 54% of the prisoners surveyed felt their personal officer was there

when they needed them and 58% of prisoners said their personal officer never came to check on how they were doing. The most common reasons given by prisoners for this lack of engagement were that personal officers were “rarely around the wing”, “always too busy/preoccupied” and “were not responsive to requests.”

7.37 We spoke to a number of officers and their managers and they referred to work detailing which frequently allocated them to tasks other than in their normal residential unit. They expressed concern that this was affecting continuity in terms of contact with prisoners and preventing staff from completing personal officer work. They told us that high workloads, exacerbated by staff shortages, meant that residential staff did not always have the time they needed to undertake personal officer work and that, in terms of priorities, this was one of the first tasks to be dropped. Whilst we saw several examples of good personal officer work, including good recording in prisoner wing history sheets, it was evident that whether a prisoner received this service depended upon a number of factors and could not be guaranteed.

7.38 Throughout the inspection we received complimentary comments from prisoners about the attitude and helpfulness of most staff and the quality of staff-prisoner relationships was generally praised. We observed interactions between staff and prisoners which confirmed the view that staff wanted to help prisoners and convinced us that most staff at Littlehey were more than capable of acting as good personal officers. Whilst prisoners were challenged when necessary, we had some concerns that staff were not always alert to the risks presented by some prisoners and therefore might unwittingly collude or reinforce inappropriate behaviour or attitudes. The likelihood of this increased when prisoners were supervised by staff who did not know them well.

Conclusion

7.39 Littlehey had a personal officer scheme which for a number of reasons was not delivering the desired outcomes in terms of contact and proactive work with prisoners.

Recommendation

7.40 Prisoners should have frequent, meaningful contact with a designated member of staff who knows them, their circumstances and risks, and who can

encourage and support them to make best use of their time in custody and to prepare for their eventual release.

CHAPTER EIGHT

SERVICES

Catering

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for catering are:

- **Safety:** Prisoners' food is prepared and served safely in accordance with Environmental Health regulations and religious requirements
- **Respect:** Prisoners receive a fair portion of healthy, balanced, nutritious and varied meals to meet their physical, gender, health, religious, ethnic and medical needs
- **Respect:** Prisoners have a choice and are encouraged to eat healthily to help them create and maintain healthy lifestyles

8.01 An analysis of our prisoner questionnaire showed that 23% of respondents regarded the food at Littlehey as good, compared with a training prison average of 28%; a further 43% regarded the food as being neither good nor bad.

8.02 A catering senior officer managed the kitchen. His staff comprised one catering officer, four civilian caterers and 20 prisoner workers. All kitchen and servery workers received training in food safety and hygiene, and all wore 'kitchen whites' when preparing and serving food.

8.03 The kitchen was clean and had non-slip flooring. Equipment was fairly new and in good working order. Food was conveyed to the wings from the kitchen in heated trolleys. Wing serveries were clean. Prisoners collected their meals from serveries on each wing and all prisoners received their meals within 20 minutes or so once the servery was open. Prison officers supervised the serving of meals and a catering officer was usually present at the mid day meal. There were occasional delays when prisoners arrived late from workshops. Prisoners could choose whether to eat their meals in the dining room or in their cells.

8.04 Meal times were usually sensibly spaced. On weekdays breakfast was served at 8.10am, lunch at 12.05pm and tea at 5.40pm. At weekends meal times were 8.40am, 12 noon and 4.45pm. The tea meal at weekends was too early and there was no supper bun or equivalent snack.

8.05 The budget per prisoner was £1.41 per day, of which 40p went to Prison Service Industries and Farms for vegetable produce. The three-week menu cycle offered a good choice of meals and included various diets and a healthy option. A cooked breakfast was provided on alternate days and at weekends. Pre-select menus offered four or five choices at the midday and tea meals. All prisoners could pre-select their meals including those in the care and separation unit and the E wing induction unit. Prisoners who worked in the outside gardens party were provided with a sandwich lunch.

8.06 Some prisoners told us that there was insufficient food and that the quality was bad. Portion size seemed reasonable to us. Catering staff said that the vegetable produce that they were obliged to purchase from Prison Service Industries and Farms was often very poor; for example, the potatoes were unripe and sometimes black. The kitchen baked its own bread rolls and baguettes.

8.07 There was very good communication between kitchen staff and prisoners. Three-monthly meetings of a food committee were chaired by the SO catering manager, and meetings were attended by some of his staff as well as prisoner representatives from all wings. Minutes of these meetings showed a real involvement and responsible participation by all. In addition, catering staff were allocated to particular wings which meant regular communication with wing staff and prisoners and consistent monitoring. Food surveys were conducted twice a year. In our sample of request/complaints, none was about meals provided by the kitchen. The catering senior officer issued an information booklet to all wings for display near the servery. Information included the times of meals, how to select a meal, the contents of beverage packs and healthy eating advice.

Conclusion

8.08 The catering arrangements at Littlehey were satisfactory. All prisoners could pre-select their meals including those in the care and separation unit and the induction unit. Prisoners could choose whether to eat their meals in the dining room or in their cells. The tea meal at weekends was served at 4.45pm and there was no supper bun or equivalent snack. Communication between kitchen staff, wing staff and prisoners was effective.

Recommendation

8.09 **The tea meal should be served later at weekends**

Good practice

8.10 *The catering manager issued an information booklet to all wings for display near the servery. Information included the times of meals, how to select a meal, the contents of beverage packs and healthy eating advice.*

Prison shop

Expected outcomes

The expected outcomes for the prison shop are:

Safety: Arrangements to enable prisoners to purchase goods minimise opportunities for bullying

Safety: Items held in the prison shop and store are stored and served according to the requirements of food safety, hygiene, religion and security

Respect: Prisoners have a suitable range of affordable goods available for purchase at reasonable prices to meet their ethnic, cultural and gender needs

8.11 The prison shop was run by a private contractor, Eurest. Three staff from the company managed the shop on site at Littlehey.

8.12 Prisoners received weekly access to goods from the prison shop. Each week they received an order form along with a statement of the amount of money available for them to spend. On reception, all prisoners received a £10 advance in order that

they could buy goods from the shop on the first available date. Lists of the goods available were held in the wings and prisoners were allowed to pay ten pence for their own copy.

8.13 Goods ordered were delivered to prisoners in their residential units during the late afternoon and early evening of the allocated day. Prisoners had to sign for the goods that they had bought, which could be seen in the sealed clear plastic bags in which they were delivered. Shop staff sometimes substituted some goods for another if there was a shortage, but prisoners were always given the opportunity of a refund if they were not satisfied with the items they had been given. There were limited opportunities for the supervision of prisoners once goods had been handed over and prisoners took their items back to their cells. It was possible that bullying and taxing could take place at this stage, but other than in B wing we received no complaints about intimidation from prisoners.

8.14 The range of goods available in the prison shop was extensive and included items for minority ethnic groups. Shop staff stated that they were prepared to respond to demand for new items and they did this either through a committee which consisted of prisoner representatives with whom shop staff met, or through talking to prisoners in their wings during the delivery of goods. A wide range of cell hobby items were available.

8.15 Shop staff appeared keen to ensure that the service they provided was efficient and effective both for the company who employed them and for the prisoners paying for and receiving the goods. It was stated that the price of goods was determined between the prison service, Eurest and the major supplier, A C Ward. Prisoners complained to us during our inspection that the prices of some goods, particularly razors, were too expensive. We were also told of current disagreements over the contract for the shop, in particular over the amount of profit that should be returned to prison funds.

8.16 The recording of prisoner transactions was accurate and up to date and goods were held in a clean environment.

Conclusion

8.17 The prison shop offered a wide range of goods for prisoners and offered an efficient and effective service. Some prisoners complained that some items were too expensive.

CHAPTER NINE

LIFE SENTENCED PRISONERS

Expected outcomes

The expected outcome for provision for life sentenced prisoners are:

Safety: Lifers trust that details of their offences and personal circumstances are treated responsibly by staff

Safety: Potential lifers on first entering custody, and newly sentenced lifers returning from court, are given close attention and support from trained staff

Respect: All lifers are able to address their risk factors and prepare for release within the timescale of their tariffs

Respect: Recalled lifers and licence revokees are dealt with promptly, openly, consistently and fairly and a regime provided for them

Respect: Staff working with lifers understand the lifer system and encourage lifers to maintain a positive approach to their sentence and work towards their eventual release

Purposeful activity: Lifers experience balanced regimes with opportunities for work, education, leisure and social interaction which afford them choice and require them to take increasing responsibility for themselves

Resettlement and reducing re-offending: Lifers are able to access help which assists them in coming to terms with their sentence and to take responsibility for their offending

Resettlement and reducing re-offending: Lifers experience a phased re-integration into the community supported by a resettlement team in the discharging prison which includes input from the home probation officer

9.01 At the time of our inspection there were 65 life sentenced prisoners in Littlehey. They were located in all the main wings with 10 to 12 on most wings and 19 in F wing, which had the best facilities. A principal officer and a governor who acted as the lifer liaison officer managed the life sentenced prisoners.

9.02 All the documentation was held securely and well managed by an enthusiastic clerk. Life sentence plans were up to date and annual reviews took place on time. We

examined a large sample of life sentence plans. Many of the annual reviews were completed without having the benefit of written comments from the personal officer; and in some cases the outcomes of reviews lacked detail. We attended one annual review; it was properly conducted and the prisoner was made to feel comfortable and part of the meeting. Time and care was taken to ensure that everyone's views were taken into account and the review of targets and future plans were very carefully considered. Personal officers did not routinely attend annual reviews.

9.03 The life sentenced prisoner population was a mixture of those who were seen as progressing through the system and those who were moving from prison to prison but not progressing. The psychology department undertook a lot of the work with them and saw them as a challenging group, because many were sex offenders and some were past their tariff. Most of the work undertaken was on a one to one basis to motivate change in attitude and behaviour. Prisoners who needed the sex offender treatment programme were prioritised to the extent that two places were reserved on each course for life sentenced prisoners but for the extended thinking skills they had to wait until their name came to the top of the waiting list. Many prisoners complained about this, as they believed it held them back from progressing through the lifer system.

9.04 All the life sentenced prisoners to whom we spoke had a personal officer and were confident to approach their officer with problems. They also told us that if they have needed an interview with the lifer principal officer or the lifer liaison officer they would be seen. Lifer days were held at least three times a year; one took place during the inspection and we took the opportunity to attend the event and speak with the families and friends of prisoners. The event was well organised and held in a relaxed atmosphere; entertainment, quizzes and lunch were provided. All the people with whom we spoke praised the staff and said they were friendly, helpful and took the time to answer their questions. It was clear that those attending appreciated the effort that had been put into the day to make it an enjoyable experience.

9.05 The main complaint made by prisoners was centred on what was often referred to as the "haves" and the "have not's". The 19 prisoners in F wing enjoyed many more privileges including in-cell electricity, courtesy locks and much better access to

the lifer principal officer whose office was in F wing. It was however made clear to the prisoners that moving to F wing was seen as progression, and that such a move had to be earned.

Conclusion

9.06 The needs of the life sentenced prisoners were being met at Littlehey. Staff supported them and were willing to resolve any problems. The dispersal of this population throughout the prison was a cause of resentment which was a constant distraction to the prisoners.

Recommendations

9.07 **Personal officers should routinely submit written reports for annual lifer reviews.**

9.08 **Personal officers should routinely attend annual lifer reviews.**

CHAPTER TEN

RECOMMENDATIONS AND GOOD PRACTICE

(Numbers in brackets refer to paragraph in main report)

Main recommendations

10.01 The reception process should be reviewed to ensure it is focused on meeting the needs of prisoners new to the establishment. (HP.37)

10.02 Mentally ill prisoners should not be held in the segregation (care and separation) unit. (HP.38 and 6.27)

10.03 All prisoners should be engaged in meaningful work, training or education which should be linked to sentence plans. (HP.39)

10.04 There should be a resettlement strategy for the prison, including an action plan for future development, which is monitored by the resettlement policy committee. (HP.40)

10.05 Adequate and effective public protection systems should be in place. (HP.41)

10.06 Electricity should be provided in all cells. (HP.42 and 2.18)

To the Area Manager

10.07 Key performance indicators for CARAT services in establishments such as Littlehey should differ from those of local prisons and reflect the importance of through care and resettlement work. (3.48)

To the Governor

Arrival in custody

10.08 Staff should be trained and encouraged to engage actively with prisoners and to discover their immediate needs upon reception. (1.15)

10.09 Reception procedures should be explained at each step in the process and time should be allowed for questions and clarification. (1.16)

10.10 The reception environment should be improved to provide a friendly and welcoming atmosphere. (1.17)

10.11 First night interviews should be conducted in a quiet and private environment in which prisoners are put at their ease and have time and opportunities to ask questions. (1.18)

10.12 First night information and the booklet “Showing prisoners the way” should be produced in languages other than English. (1.19)

10.13 Feedback should be sought from prisoners on their experience and opinion of the induction programme. (1.20)

Residential units

10.14 Prisoners in shared accommodation should receive maximum time out of cell. (2.14)

10.15 An offensive display policy should be drawn up which includes, as part of the prison’s public protection work, guidance on the appropriate use of censorship and monitoring of materials held by prisoners. (2.15)

10.16 Better arrangements should be made for prisoners to wash and dry their clothing in the wing. (2.16)

10.17 Prisoners should receive clothing of the right size. (2.17)

Duty of care

10.18 The range of programmes available to support interventions with bullies and victims should be increased, particularly to address more entrenched attitudes or behaviour. (3.09)

10.19 The use of Listeners in reception should be encouraged. (3.18)

10.20 Care suites should create an atmosphere in which prisoners at risk of self-harm feel able to relax. (3.19)

10.21 The prison should satisfy itself that it is meeting the needs of foreign national prisoners, in line with developing good practice within the Prison Service. (3.27)

10.22 Non- or poor English speaking prisoners should be enabled to understand and to communicate effectively with staff. (3.28)

10.23 A dedicated officer should be made available to the RAPT programme, as specified in the contract, to meet the voluntary drug testing requirements. (3.49)

10.24 RAPT staff should consider running relapse prevention and pre-release groups for programme “graduates”. (3.50)

10.25 The drug strategy team should monitor patterns of referrals to the RAPT programme and explore reasons behind any changes. (3.51)

10.26 Voluntary drug testing should be promoted throughout the prison, and officers detailed for this task should be available. (3.52)

10.27 Closed visits should be screened off so that visitors and prisoners are not visible to others in the visits hall. (3.76)

10.28 There should be greater recognition by the prison of the work undertaken on their behalf by the visitors centre. (3.77)

10.29 All areas of the visits hall, and in particular the toilets, should be thoroughly cleaned before visits take place. (3.78)

Healthcare

10.30 The Regional Prison Health Development Team, PCT chief executive and governor should continue efforts to improve prisoner access to and support from mental health services within the local NHS mental health provision. This should include the establishment of a multi-disciplinary team including occupational therapy and psychology. If possible, mental health day services in the prison should be established. (4.42)

10.31 The PCT chief executive, governor and head of health care should review the advertisement and job description for the medical officer post to reflect better both current practice and the requirements of the Doctors' Working Party Report. (4.43)

10.32 The current initiatives should be sustained with the development of more nurse led clinics, more use of nurse triage, establishment of a pharmacy clinic and greater integration of health care across the whole prison. (4.44)

10.33 The governor and head of healthcare should review weekend staffing levels. If a seven day service is desirable, weekend opening should not be compromised by the HCO on duty being removed for other duties. (4.45)

10.34 The new location of the 'gated-cell' should be determined according to its function. (4.46)

10.35 A drugs and therapeutics committee should be established to review the in-possession and special sick policies, update the prescribing formulary, and introduce policies for patient group directives and medicines management. (4.47)

10.36 Clinical supervision for all staff should be formalised with the PCT within the overall framework of clinical governance implementation. (4.48)

10.37 The design and function of the new treatment/waiting area should be changed to enable patient confidentiality and privacy. (4.49)

10.38 There should be a review of the dental waiting list, in consultation with the practitioner. Extra clinical sessions should be offered to reduce the waiting list to a more acceptable level. (4.50)

10.39 The prison should have a formal contractual arrangement with the dentist and a 'value for money' audit should be carried out annually to determine the cost effectiveness of the dental care provided. (4.51)

Activities

10.40 Allocation to activities should be integrated into the sentence planning process. (5.23)

10.41 Pay rates should be reviewed and the pay disincentive for prisoners to choose education and training removed. (5.24)

10.42 The results of basic skills assessments should be shared with workshop staff. (5.25)

10.43 Prisoners should be able to undertake a mix of education, training and work activities to meet their individual needs. (5.26)

10.44 The library should stock books to support education courses. (5.27)

10.45 The library should stock compact discs. (5.28)

10.46 Prisoner access to the library should be regular, predictable and not restricted unnecessarily. (5.29)

10.47 A needs analysis should be carried out to determine the types of recreational activities which should be offered by the PE department. (5.37)

- 10.48 The multi-faith room should provide a neutral environment. (5.45)
- 10.49 Prisoners in E wing should have more time out of cell. (5.52)
- 10.50 Roll checks should be completed in time to allow full periods of association. (5.53)
- 10.51 All prisoners should be offered daily exercise or association. (5.54)

Good order

- 10.52 Prisoners in the care and separation unit should have access to purposeful activity. (6.26)
- 10.53 Prisoners in the care and separation unit should receive daily showers. (6.28)
- 10.54 Prisoners being held on good order and discipline in residential units should be given their basic entitlements. (6.29)
- 10.55 The facilities list should be linked into the IEP scheme. (6.38)
- 10.56 The facilities list should be expanded and prisoners should be allowed to have most of the items handed or posted in. (6.39)
- 10.57 Prison managers should be able to access up to date information about the home area of all prisoners currently held at Littlehey. (6.48)
- 10.58 All prisoners should have their categorisation status reviewed regularly and particularly whenever there is a change in risk factors. (6.49)
- 10.59 Re-categorisation and allocation decisions should be clear, open and fair. (6.50)
- 10.60 Re-categorisation reviews should be integrated with sentence planning and other sentence management procedures. (6.51)

Resettlement

10.61 Littlehey should develop a clear resettlement policy or policies for the whole establishment based on an up to date analysis of the resettlement needs of the prisoner population. (7.24)

10.62 Access and allocation to purposeful activity and offending behaviour programmes should be linked to prisoners' assessed needs and their sentence plan targets. (7.25)

10.63 Prisoners should be helped to prepare for their release in adequate time to allow appropriate arrangements to be made and for outstanding matters of concern to be dealt with. (7.26)

10.64 Robust, routine arrangements should be introduced to assess the risk of harm presented by each prisoner and to identify quickly those to whom public protection or dangerous offender procedures applied. (7.27)

10.65 Sentence plan targets should be challenging, realistic and address resettlement objectives as well as the prisoner's purposeful use of time at Littlehey. (7.28)

10.66 Sentence plans should inform all decisions relevant to the prisoner's resettlement. (7.29)

10.67 The system for assessment and referral of prisoners to offending behaviour programmes should be reviewed so that all prisoners have a realistic chance of completing identified courses before their earliest date of release. (7.30)

10.68 Prisoners should have frequent, meaningful contact with a designated member of staff who knows them, their circumstances and risks, and who can encourage and support them to make best use of their time in custody and to prepare for their eventual release. (7.40)

Services

10.69 The tea meal should be served later at weekends. (8.09)

Life sentenced prisoners

10.70 Personal officers should submit written reports for annual lifer reviews routinely. (9.07)

10.71 Personal officers should routinely attend annual lifer reviews. (9.08)

EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE

10.72 A buddy scheme had been set up to provide support and advice to actual or potential victims of bullying. (3.10)

10.73 The RRLO was supported in his work by a group of 13 prisoners, 11 race relations representatives and two co-ordinators. These prisoner representatives held copies of racial incident forms and prisoners were encouraged to discuss their concerns or complaints with a race relations representative to determine if it was appropriate and to access help and advice as necessary. (3.29)

10.74 The CARAT team emphasised resettlement, and we saw their multi-disciplinary approach as an example of good practice. (3.53)

10.75 Auricular acupuncture treatment was available to CARAT and rehabilitation programme clients. (3.54)

10.76 Individuals' assessed need was matched with rehabilitation provision in-house or at another establishment. (3.55)

10.77 Seventy two per cent of prisoners completed RAPT's rehabilitation programme. (3.56)

10.78 The drug strategy team involved families and community-based providers in the care and rehabilitation of prisoners with drug and alcohol problems. (3.57)

10.79 Prisoners could gain prompt access to the PIN phone system after reception. (3.79)

10.80 The request/complaints clerk opened the yellow boxes in the wings, in which request/complaint forms were posted. (3.84)

10.81 The development of effective health promotion clinics and the emphasis placed on prisoners taking responsibility for their own health was laudable. (4.52)

10.82 The initiatives around sexual health and blood borne viruses were also impressive, particularly the establishment of a group to advise and support sexually active prisoners. (4.53)

10.83 Autoclave indicators were used in every cycle. (4.54)

10.84 The introduction of repeat prescription cards for prisoners' personal use was in line with community pharmacy systems and highlighted the proactive work of the pharmacy department. (4.55)

10.85 Effective links with industry had resulted in additional resources for the prison and improved opportunities for prisoners on release. (5.30)

10.86 Muslim prisoners observing Ramadan were allowed on request, to go into retreat and they were not required to work. (5.46)

10.87 The holistic view of prisoners was commendable and contributed to ensuring that relatively few prisoners became locked into a cycle of poor behaviour and adjudications leading to confinement in the care and separation unit. (6.30)

10.88 A member of the Board of Visitors visited the unit almost every day, which was commendable. (6.31)

10.89 The HDC clerk sent relevant documentation to home probation areas in sufficient time to allow them one month to complete their enquiries; this had significantly increased the number of forms being returned and hence probably improved the quality of decisions. (7.31)

10.90 Details of outstanding sentence plans were recorded, including the name of the responsible personal officer, and this information passed regularly to residential wing managers for action. (7.32)

10.91 The sentence planning clerk recorded what stage had been reached in respect of each prisoner's sentence plan on the computerised prisoner database (LIDS) allowing other staff to easily access this information. (7.33)

10.92 Once completed, a copy of the sentenced plan was sent to the home probation area even if no designated probation officer had been allocated at that stage. (7.34)

10.93 The catering manager issued an information booklet to all wings for display near the servery. Information included the times of meals, how to select a meal, the contents of beverage packs and healthy eating advice. (8.10)

