

Report on an announced inspection of

HMP Kirklevington

Grange

9 –13 May 2011

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2011

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
Healthy prison summary	9
1 Safety	
<hr/>	
Courts, escorts and transfers	15
First days in custody	15
Bullying and violence reduction	16
Self-harm suicide	17
Security and rules	18
Incentives and earned privileges	20
Disciplinary procedures	20
Substance misuse	21
2 Respect	
<hr/>	
Residential units	23
Staff-prisoner relationships	24
Equality and diversity	24
Faith and religious activity	28
Complaints	29
Legal rights	29
Health services	30
Catering	34
Shop	35
3 Purposeful activity	
<hr/>	
Time out of cell	37
Learning and skills and work activities	37
Physical education and healthy living	41
4 Resettlement	
<hr/>	
Strategic management of resettlement	43
Offender management and planning	44
Reintegration planning	47
5 Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice	53
<hr/>	

Appendices

I Inspection team	58
II Prison population profile	59
III Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	61

Introduction

Kirklevington Grange¹ is a small, specialist resettlement prison preparing men coming to the end of long sentences for their return to the community – mostly locally in the North East of England. It performed its specialist function very well.

Kirklevington carefully selected its prisoners and so, of course, in that and in other ways, a comparison with many other prisons might seem unfair. However, the principles that Kirklevington successfully applied – of men making progress by working hard to put something back into the community and to acquire the skills, experience and confidence they will need to get and hold down a job on release – are principles that have a wider application in the prison system.

The prison was very safe. Diversity work, health care and basic services such as catering were all of a high standard. Prisoners were treated with respect and individual attention was paid to their progression. High standards of conduct and motivation were expected in return and these were rigorously enforced. In 2010, 95 men had been returned to closed conditions; while we believed this approach was right, recording of these decisions and other sanctions needed to be improved.

Most prisoners were highly motivated to make progress but needed support to do so. I spoke to one newly-arrived, older man looking through the fence over the countryside to the Cleveland Hills in the distance. He told me it was the first time he had had a view of more than a few yards for many years and that while he looked forward to his release, he was anxious about it too.

Men moved through the prison from the older, more typical accommodation attached to the main building to new, higher standard, en-suite accommodation. In parallel, men progressed from the good quality training workshops inside the prison to unpaid community work outside the prison before, in most cases, concluding their sentence by doing paid work outside the prison and having the opportunity to re-establish home and community links through home leave and release on temporary licence. The opportunity for prisoners to work or undertake activities outside the prison was subject to rigorous risk assessment. This caused some frustration among prisoners but we were satisfied it was a necessary, fair and proportionate process. All prisoners had the opportunity to participate in good quality education in day or evening classes.

The prison had impressive community links with a good focus on restorative justice principles. A 12-strong taskforce undertook local community project work and the prison offered 65 placements outside the prison with local community organisations. Prison facilities, such as the gym, were used to host community events, such as activities for young people with learning difficulties, in which prisoners participated. Some men who had been helped to address their own drug problems were training to become volunteer drugs workers.

¹ Kirklevington Grange was a pilot for some adjustments to the Inspectorate's Expectations, inspection methodology and report format. We hope the changes will make our Expectations more outcome- focused and the reports and recommendations easier to follow and a more effective tool to help establishments improve. Formal consultation on the revised Expectations will take place later in 2011.

The governor personally led the prison's resettlement strategy, of which employment, training and education were the central feature. Prisoners recorded their own progress in open 'green files' and the governor and offender management staff used the files to offer encouragement and advice. It was a good system that would have been improved further if personal officers had made better use of it. It was rare for a man to leave the prison without somewhere suitable to live. Other aspects of resettlement were also good but had been subject to some recent reorganisation. This needed monitoring to ensure there was no reduction in effectiveness.

Kirklevington Grange performs its specialist role effectively. At a time when 'working prisons' and reparation to the community are under much discussion, ministers could do worse than look at how Kirklevington tackles these issues.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

July 2011

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Semi-open resettlement prison for adult male prisoners

Prison status

Public

Region

North East

Number held

282

Certified normal accommodation

283

Operational capacity

283

Date of last full inspection

18- 22 July 2005

Follow up inspection: 9-12 March 2009

Brief history

Situated near Yarm, about 10 miles from Middlesbrough and Darlington, Kirklevington opened as a junior detention centre in 1962, continuing in that role until it became a young offender institution in 1988. In 1992 it closed briefly and opened in October 1992 as a specialist resettlement prison. It is the largest of only three such prisons, with a regime for long-term prisoners in need of resettlement. In 2008, an additional housing block was built increasing the population to 283.

Short description of residential units

A, B, C, F, G, H, J and R units – single rooms in the main building

D and E units – 40 single rooms with en-suite facilities in two prefabricated buildings

K unit – 40 single rooms in a prefabricated building

L unit – 60 single rooms with en-suite facilities; opened in 2008

Escort contractor

G4S

Health service commissioner and provider

County Durham NHS Primary Care Trust and Care UK and Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys NHS Foundation Trust

Learning and skills provider

The Manchester College

Healthy prison summary

Introduction

HP1 All inspection reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of prisoners, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. The criteria are:

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

HP2 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the National Offender Management Service.

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

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

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

There is evidence of adverse outcomes for prisoners in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.

- outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of prisoners. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.

- outcomes for prisoners are poor against this healthy prison test.

There is evidence that the outcomes for prisoners are seriously affected by current practice. There is a failure to ensure even adequate treatment of and/or conditions for prisoners. Immediate remedial action is required.

Safety

- HP3 Men had an appropriate introduction to the different conditions at Kirklevington. The prison was very safe with almost no bullying or self-harm. High standards of behaviour were expected and enforced. Prisoners were usually only segregated for a short time before transfers, and there was no use of force. There was a detailed supply reduction action plan but positive mandatory drug test results were a little over target. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.
- HP4 Low and medium risk prisoners coming to the end of sentences were selected to come to the prison. Few had long journeys. Men came to Kirklevington on planned progressive moves and, compared with other similar prisons, a relatively high proportion in our survey² said they had got information in advance about the prison. However, not all did and some had unrealistic expectations about what to expect, particularly in relation to how soon they would be able to work outside the prison.
- HP5 Prisoners were well treated in reception by friendly and welcoming staff. Almost all men said they had felt safe in the prison on their first night. There was a good introduction to the prison, reinforced by helpful support from an induction orderly.
- HP6 Kirklevington was a very safe place. The prison was not complacent about this and there was regular thorough scrutiny of indicators of violence to help maintain this position. High standards of behaviour were expected and it was made clear that bullying would not be tolerated, with the ultimate sanction of a return to closed conditions. We agreed a robust approach was necessary to maintain safety but decisions to remove prisoners needed to be backed up by full written reasons.
- HP7 There had been no incidents of self-harm in recent years and the few assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents opened were as a result of concern about mood. On rare occasions when vulnerable prisoners needed more intensive support they were transferred to closed prisons with facilities to care for them. Men said they got good support from Listeners and prisoner representatives.
- HP8 The main security challenges were drugs and managing individual risk effectively. Security was well managed and relevant objectives were set. There was a generally proportionate approach but supporting records and documentation for procedures

² **Inspection methodology:** There are five key sources of evidence for inspection: observation; prisoner surveys; discussions with prisoners; discussions with staff and relevant third parties; and documentation. During inspections, we use a mixed-method approach to data gathering, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. All findings and judgements are triangulated, which increases the validity of the data gathered. Survey results show the collective response (in percentages) from prisoners in the establishment being inspected compared with the collective response (in percentages) from respondents in all establishments of that type (the comparator figure). Where references to comparisons between these two sets of figures are made in the report, these relate to statistically significant differences only. Statistical significance is a way of estimating the likelihood that a difference between two samples indicates a real difference between the populations from which the samples are taken, rather than being due to chance. If a result is very unlikely to have arisen by chance, we say it is 'statistically significant'. The significance level is set at 0.05, which means that there is only a 5% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

(Adapted from Towel et al (eds), *Dictionary of Forensic Psychology*.)

such as recategorisation did not always fully justify decisions. Some measures, such as double hand-cuffing prisoners returning to closed conditions, were unnecessary. The positive mandatory drug test rate for the previous year was just above target but supply and demand reduction initiatives were well integrated and a detailed supply reduction action plan had been developed.

- HP9 Disciplinary charges were for appropriately serious matters rather than minor misdemeanours. Records of hearings did not always indicate sufficient enquiry or reasons for findings of guilt and there were no quality assurance arrangements, but punishments appeared fair. Commendably, there had been no force used for some years. The segregation unit was basic but adequate for its main function of holding prisoners for short periods before they returned to closed conditions.
- HP10 The prison was able to accept prisoners under the integrated drug treatment system but demand was likely to be extremely low and it was difficult to see how the investment was justified.

Respect

HP11 The standard of accommodation was mostly satisfactory. Prisoner-staff relationships were very good. Personal officers were mostly helpful but entries in prisoner records were sparse. Diversity work was positive. Chaplains played an active role in the prison. The food was good. Health services were excellent and replicated community standards. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

- HP12 The prison was a decent and clean environment with generally good, although variable, standards of accommodation. All men had their own rooms with good access to laundries and showers, although there were some problems with water pressure and temperature in some showers. The quality of meals was good but men had very few facilities to cook for themselves.
- HP13 Relationships between staff and prisoners were positive, and officers and managers modelled and expected appropriate standards of behaviour. High proportions of respondents to our survey said that most staff treated them with respect and that they had a member of staff they could turn to for help. There were effective consultation arrangements. All men had designated personal officers and nearly all said they were helpful. A good and innovative system allowed prisoners to make their own entries in files to record progress but their regular entries were not matched by personal officers.
- HP14 Diversity was well led by the governor. There was an effective single equality scheme with good promotion of each diversity area. Active support and consultation groups were run for older men, for black and minority ethnic men and for ex-servicemen. Drop-in sessions had been offered for gay or bisexual men. While the perceptions of black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners were generally similar to others in our survey, more in these groups said they had been threatened or intimidated by staff. Ethnic monitoring showed no obvious imbalances in outcomes. Reported racist incidents were mostly minor involving graffiti but there was a firm response. There was adequate support and monitoring for men with disabilities. There were no foreign national prisoners and it was possible that UK Border Agency procedures made it difficult for otherwise suitable candidates to apply.

- HP15 All faiths had appropriate access to worship and ministry. Chaplains worked well together, special occasions were celebrated in an inclusive way and there was a range of inter-faith events. Strong links had been made with local faith communities, which provided practical support, including with community placements. The chaplaincy supported work with families and was involved with many aspects of the work of the prison life.
- HP16 Some prisoners said that they were they were reluctant to make formal written complaints in case of potential repercussions that might put their place at Kirklevington in jeopardy. We were satisfied that this perception was misplaced. Replies to complaints were polite and timely.
- HP17 Prisoners were exceptionally satisfied with health services and 99% in our survey said the overall quality was good. They said they felt as respected and well treated as if they were patients in local health centres. Clinical governance arrangements were good and effective partnership working was underpinned by a solid health needs assessment. There was an appropriate range of primary care clinics, individualised lifelong conditions care, and age-related health screening for the under-25s and over-50s. Most men used community-based dentistry but there were also good dental facilities on site with no waiting list. There was good support for men with common mental health problems, and ready access to counselling services.

Purposeful activity

HP18 Prisoners were able to spend most of the time out of their rooms. There were sufficient good quality activity places to keep men occupied in the prison and very effective use of training, education and employment opportunities in the community. A commendably high number of men were engaged in external paid employment and it was very positive that community work had a clear focus on restorative justice principles. The library provision was satisfactory. PE facilities were good. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test

- HP19 All men had allocated activities and spent most of their time out of their rooms with free movement around the prison.
- HP20 The prison had a very clear strategic direction for learning and skills with a focus on resettlement. Provision was based on a good needs analysis and there was very effective work with external partners, which provided prisoners with a wide range of employment, education and training opportunities. Good quality assurance arrangements helped improve provision.
- HP21 The library was small but adequate with reasonable access. Stock was satisfactory but neither prisoners nor library staff had adequate access to web-based material, despite the fact that many prisoners were able to use the internet in the community.
- HP22 There were sufficient work places in the prison and it was very positive that over 50 prisoners were in paid employment outside the prison. In addition, more than 80 prisoners were engaged in unpaid community work. Projects had a clear restorative justice theme, which promoted positive community engagement as well as good quality work. Vocational training was available in most work areas. Workshops replicated commercial standards, pass rates were high on most training courses and

a good work ethic was developed. Individual coaching was good and instructional officers had a good commercial understanding. Opportunities for progression were good and around 20 prisoners attended external vocational training courses. Staff recognised and recorded progress and achievement of social and personal skills.

- HP23 Over 100 prisoners participated in classroom-based education in the prison each month and they could also take part in a wide range of external courses in the community. Initial assessments of prisoners' literacy and numeracy needs were timely and comprehensive, and used well to produce detailed individual learning plans. Very good personal support was provided and prisoners were effectively directed to the most appropriate courses. Teaching and learning were good with high pass rates on most courses, although the pass rates for numeracy had declined. Many men progressed to a wide range of higher level education courses with external providers.
- HP24 Prisoners had good access to a wide range of sports and PE facilities, including outdoor pitches, although there was little cover for staff absences. A suitable range of accredited courses was run in the prison and some men had progressed to level 2 or 3 gym instructor qualifications with partner colleges and one was taking a foundation degree in sports and management.

Resettlement

- HP25 A good whole-prison approach to resettlement was underpinned by an effective strategy, with an excellent focus on engaging prisoners in education, training and employment. Sentence plans were well focused on reducing reoffending, and reintegration services were satisfactory. Prisoners with previous drug and alcohol problems received good help. Family links were well supported, particularly through use of release on temporary licence (ROTL). Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test
- HP26 There was a clear whole-prison approach to the prison's specialist resettlement function and good engagement with a wide range of community partners. The reducing reoffending policy was based on an up-to-date needs analysis and usefully covered offender management and provision for each resettlement pathway.
- HP27 The offender management unit was well organised. Offender assessments we looked at were of good quality with appropriate sentence plan targets. Offender supervisors contacted new arrivals within a week and aimed to provide a fresh assessment within eight weeks. However, a number of assessments were behind schedule. Prisoners who presented a risk to the public were identified promptly and cases were well managed. Arrangements for home detention curfew assessments were sound and decisions were made promptly. Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners were allocated suitably trained offender supervisors and quarterly consultation meetings were held to keep them up to date.
- HP28 Prisoners were informed during induction of resettlement services and where they could get advice and support. A limited check of prisoners' outstanding needs was made before discharge, but in practice most needs had already been identified and addressed through the process of home leave applications and associated risk assessments.

- HP29 In our survey, few respondents expected that they would have a problem with finding accommodation on release, and in the quarter before the inspection no prisoners had been released without an address. A NACRO housing service had recently ended and advice was now provided by a probation service officer but it was too early to say how effective this arrangement was. A new community-based project that aimed to provide a comprehensive advice and financial education service was about to replace a previous service. Prisoners were helped to open bank accounts.
- HP30 Employment, training and education were central to the prison's resettlement function and learning and skills staff had a clear view of the skills shortages and employment opportunities in areas where prisoners were to be released. There was a very effective careers information and advice support service, and learning and skills targets were incorporated into sentence plans with a clear focus on helping develop skills to gain employment on release. Job search facilities were available in the prison and temporary release was used extensively for prisoners to seek paid employment or training. Prisoners had good opportunities to develop their CV writing and interview skills and were helped with disclosure and applications. Good links with a variety of employers and training providers were effectively used to enable prisoners to access or continue work and training before and after release. An impressive 70% of men left the prison with paid employment to go to.
- HP31 Substance misuse needs assessments were well used to inform service provision, about which men were very positive. Those with drug and alcohol problems had easy access to a good range of support services and were actively encouraged to engage with local community initiatives during their time in the prison and after release
- HP32 A high proportion of men said they had been helped to maintain contact with family and friends in the prison and many had the opportunity to maintain and re-establish relationships through temporary release. Regular children's days were held. A useful Barnardo's family course aimed at men with substance use problems had been run the previous year and a further one was planned. Visitors were positive about their treatment and visits arrangements were generally relaxed.
- HP33 Accredited offending behaviour programmes and other interventions were available in the community for the small number of prisoners who needed them. In the prison a relapse prevention programme was run for violent offenders who had completed programmes previously.

Main concerns and recommendations

- HP34 There were no major issues leading to the need for main recommendations.

Section 1: Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Most prisoners did not have long journeys and there were few escorted court moves. Not all prisoners received up-to-date information about the prison before their arrival.
- 1.2 The prison was designed for prisoners at the end of their sentence. Prisoners applied to come to Kirklevington and were individually assessed for their suitability. An average of 22 men had arrived each month during 2010. Most prisoners arrived in cellular vans and did not have long journeys.
- 1.3 In our survey, only 27% of respondents said that they had received up-to-date information about the prison before their arrival, compared with 54% in 2005. As prisoners had applied for a place, we would have expected them to have received written information. Some prisoners said they had only received word-of-mouth information about Kirklevington Grange at their previous establishment, and had found the reality to be different from their expectations, especially in how soon they could work outside the prison. Published information about the prison was sent to observation, classification and allocation departments rather than to the prisoner himself. An officer visited HMPs Holme House, Acklington and Durham each month to talk to interested prisoners about the opportunities available at Kirklevington, and explained the role of the prison.

Housekeeping point

- 1.4 Prisoners applying for a place at Kirklevington Grange should be fully informed of the regimes, services and timescales they will be subject to in advance of their arrival.

First days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.5 Prisoners were very positive in our survey about reception, first night and induction arrangements. Reception and induction staff engaged well with new arrivals who were very well supported by an induction orderly. Prisoners received relevant information on their day of arrival and during induction.

- 1.6 The reception was small but clean and bright, and reception officers were courteous and engaged positively with prisoners. New arrivals were searched and treated respectfully, but they were asked to disclose any disability in the hearing of other staff and prisoners, which could have inhibited disclosure or requests for help. In our survey, 84% of respondents, higher than the comparator, said that they were well treated in reception.
- 1.7 Written policy outlined the procedures for new arrivals who were all offered a free telephone call in reception and the opportunity to buy a reception pack or telephone credit.
- 1.8 A supportive induction orderly met all new arrivals in reception and acted as a point of contact during their first night and first few weeks in the prison. He escorted them to their allocated room and to health care, accompanied them to obtain items from the stores and to the dining room for their evening meal, and showed them around the prison. Minutes of prisoner consultation meetings frequently praised the support given by the orderly, as did prisoners who arrived during the inspection week.
- 1.9 All new arrivals were given well-prepared single rooms on R wing. Nearly all respondents to the survey said that they felt safe on their first night. The induction orderly gave the names of new arrivals to a Listener, who spoke to each man individually shortly after his arrival.
- 1.10 A published induction policy clearly outlined the process. All prisoners received immediate necessary information during an induction talk with an officer on their day of arrival. The presentation was informal and prisoners were encouraged to ask questions but they were asked in a group if they wished to speak to the officer in private, which could have inhibited some from requesting individual help.
- 1.11 Prisoners received a printed précis of the induction talk, an information booklet, and signed compacts. They were told the names of their allocated personal officer and back-up officer. They were able to make notes in a small pocket file given to them which also detailed support available under each resettlement pathway and included the induction timetable and contact details of relevant staff.
- 1.12 Prisoners were expected to take some responsibility for their induction by familiarising themselves with the establishment, and to make appointments to meet a variety of staff to obtain information and undertake assessments. These were recorded on completion.
- 1.13 Once a week, a probation service officer (PSO) held a session to explain how to access resettlement pathway services and prisoners who needed help were referred to appropriate services. The sentence planning process was explained and prisoners were invited to contact their offender manager through a free telephone call. A number of useful information DVDs were shown and prisoners engaged well in discussion and were encouraged to ask questions.
- 1.14 Prisoners were invited to complete an evaluation of induction on completion. In our survey, nearly all respondents said that they had undertaken induction and more than the comparator said it covered all they needed to know.

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

Everyone feels safe from bullying and victimisation (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault). Prisoners at risk/subject to victimisation are protected

through active and fair systems known to staff, prisoners and visitors, and that inform all aspects of the regime.

- 1.15 The prison was very safe with almost no bullying and few incidents of violence. High standards of behaviour were expected and enforced. There was good investigation and monitoring of the relatively minor incidents that occurred. In the few cases where prisoners were returned to closed prisons, better records of supporting evidence were needed.
- 1.16 Prisoners regarded Kirklevington as a very safe place, and this was reflected in positive responses to our survey and internal surveys. The careful selection criteria and prisoners' personal investment in their progress contributed to safety. Very few respondents said that they had witnessed any bullying in the prison.
- 1.17 High standards of behaviour were expected and it was made clear that bullying would not be tolerated. Two officers who acted as safer custody coordinators completed thorough investigations into what were mostly relatively minor incidents. Some involved prisoners using other prisoners' telephone accounts but follow-ups of anonymous notes, verbal insults, and allegations about spreading rumours were typical of the type of incidents investigated. Four prisoners had been monitored under the anti-bullying strategy in the previous six months. Two had been returned to closed conditions because of allegations of bullying, but there was insufficient written record of the evidence to fully explain and justify such moves (see paragraph 1.25 and recommendation 1.33). Appropriate support plans were developed for victims of bullying.
- 1.18 A safer custody and violence reduction action plan was regularly updated and there was careful and thorough scrutiny of indicators of violence at a well-attended quarterly safer custody meeting. This was chaired by a senior manager and included an analysis of records of injuries to prisoners (F213s) and any adjudications, complaints, reports of racist incidents or security information reports related to violence. Figures were produced for each month and some monitoring of trends was beginning.

Self-harm and suicide

Expected outcomes:

Prisons work to reduce the risks of suicide and self-harm through a whole-prison approach. Prisoners are identified at an early stage and given the necessary support. All staff are aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, are appropriately trained and have access to proper equipment and support.

- 1.19 The positive and supportive environment contributed to prisoners' feelings of well-being and recorded incidents of self-harm were rare. The very few prisoners regarded as a higher risk were transferred to prisons with better facilities to care for them. Listeners and other representatives provided good support.
- 1.20 There had been no incidents of self-harm in the prison in recent years and the few assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents opened were a result of concern about mood or vulnerability.

- 1.21 Six ACCTs had been opened in 2010 and none to date in 2011. Five of the prisoners were transferred to closed conditions, although in two cases the documents had been opened after the prisoners had been informed they were being transferred for other reasons. One man came back to Kirklevington after a period of observation at HMP Holme House. There was only one ACCT document available to review, which had been open for just one day and had been completed satisfactorily.
- 1.22 Prisoners reported good support from the Listener team of nine prisoners, and other prisoner representatives. Listeners were used infrequently and usually informally. Seven of them had completed a mental health first aid course. Listeners said that the main source of anxiety for prisoners was associated with delays in the completion of risk assessments. There was free telephone access to the Samaritans, who visited the prison monthly to support Listeners.
- 1.23 As incidents of self-harm were very infrequent and few ACCT documents were opened, discussion at the quarterly safer custody meeting mostly focused on procedural and audit requirements.

Security and rules

Expected outcomes:

Security and good order are maintained through an attention to physical and procedural matters, including effective intelligence security as well as positive staff-prisoner relationships. Prisoners are aware of the rules and routines of the prison, which are proportionate, fair and encourage responsible behaviour. Prisoners are safe from exposure to substance misuse while in prison.

- 1.24 Security arrangements were, with some exceptions, broadly proportionate and focused predominantly on risk management. Dynamic security was effective and responsive. Mandatory drug testing was well managed. Drug supply and demand reduction initiatives were well integrated. Rules were thoroughly explained and reinforced by staff and other prisoners.
- 1.25 There was an appropriate focus on risk management and public protection, and a near zero-tolerance approach when prisoners were believed to threaten the safety of the public or the integrity of the ethos of the resettlement prison. In 2010 and 2011 respectively, 95 and 11 prisoners had returned to closed conditions, almost all of whom were recategorised. This robust approach appeared proportionate but was too often insufficiently evidenced in documentation. It was not clear that recategorisation from D to C was always justified.
- 1.26 Dynamic security arrangements were effective and responsive. In the previous six months, there had been 439 security information reports (SIRs), of which drugs was by far the most common subject. Actions generated from SIRs were completed within reasonably promptly.
- 1.27 The positive mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate for 2010-11 had been 8.11%, slightly over the target of 7%. The MDT programme was well coordinated and random testing was spread throughout the month. Suspicion testing requests were met within the required timeframe. Of the 33 suspicion tests in the previous six months, 16 were positive (49%). Only six of 24 requests for risk assessment tests had been completed.
- 1.28 Alcohol testing was conducted in reception on either a risk or a suspicion basis and following adjudication some men were subject to frequent testing. Between January and May 2011, 34

tests were undertaken resulting in six fails. All prisoners who tested positive for drugs or alcohol were referred to the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) team for support. Supply and demand reduction initiatives were well integrated, with good links between security staff and drugs workers. There was a detailed supply reduction action plan.

- 1.29 The security committee was reasonably well attended and given a high priority. A comprehensive intelligence assessment included some trend analysis, and there were appropriate security objectives.
- 1.30 In the previous six months, nine prisoners were reported as unlawfully at large (UAL) or as failures to return (FTR) from activities outside the prison. The last abscond was recorded in March 2009.
- 1.31 While most security arrangements were proportionate, there were a number that appeared unnecessary or were not well explained to prisoners. Prisoners on visits were permitted to play outside with their children but were required to sit in a designated seat while in the visits hall and could not collect refreshments for their families. Prisoners in paid employment were permitted to use mobile telephones outside the prison but those in community work were not. Prisoners complained about a lack of consistency on items that were permitted to be brought back following town visits, home leave or work. Most prisoners were returned to closed conditions using two sets of handcuffs (double cuff), which was unnecessary. Strip searching was not always conducted on an intelligence-led basis: all new arrivals were strip searched; and prisoners were routinely strip searched on admission to the segregation unit (see paragraph 1.45).
- 1.32 Prisoners did not feel that the security measures impeded their access to the regime unnecessarily. They were, however, at times frustrated by decisions to 'gate' them. Prisoners were gated when there were concerns about the risks they posed to themselves, other prisoners, staff or the public which needed to be investigated. A new risk assessment was usually completed quickly and we were satisfied that these measures were appropriate and proportionate to manage the potential risk.

Recommendations

- 1.33 Decisions to return prisoners to closed conditions should be fully evidenced in records.
- 1.34 All security measures should be proportionate and reflect the security status of prisoners at Kirklevington.

Rules

- 1.35 Rules were comprehensively explained during induction and were reinforced by staff and prisoner peer workers. During their induction, prisoners signed compacts that included rules and expectations of them while at Kirklevington Grange. These signed compacts were kept in their 'green files' (see paragraph 2.14) for them to access at any time.

Incentives and earned privileges

Expected outcomes:

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

1.36 The prison did not operate an incentives and earned privileges scheme. The major influence on prisoners' behaviour was their wish to retain their place in the positive resettlement regime.

1.37 As a resettlement prison, Kirklevington was not required to operate an incentives and earned privileges scheme and had not done so since 2006. Prisoners' behaviour was motivated by their wish to retain their place in the prison and to benefit from the resettlement regime which offered advancement to better quality accommodation and opportunities to participate in community activities as part of staged progression. This worked effectively.

Disciplinary procedures

Expected outcomes:

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

1.38 The formal disciplinary process was used relatively infrequently. Adjudication records did not always indicate sufficient enquiry before a finding of guilt, and there was no quality assurance. Commendably, there had been no use of force. The segregation unit was basic but mainly used for short periods for prisoners returning to closed conditions.

Disciplinary procedures

1.39 In the previous six months, there had been 77 adjudications mainly for licence failures, MDT failures and possession of unauthorised items, rather than minor matters. There was some inconsistent practice in when charges were laid for prisoners who returned late from release on temporary licence (ROTL). The adjudication records we sampled did not always indicate that there was sufficient enquiry before a finding of guilt, and there was little consideration of possible defences when prisoners were late back from licence. Reasons for the decisions reached were often not recorded. It was not always clear that mitigation was taken into account, but punishments were fair.

1.40 Adjudication standardisation meetings were held, although infrequently, but there was no quality assurance process to examine records and promote good practice.

Recommendation

1.41 All disciplinary charges should be fully investigated with clear reasons given for the decisions reached.

Housekeeping point

- 1.42 There should be a quality assurance system for adjudications.

The use of force

- 1.43 It was commendable that force had not been used since 2008.

Segregation unit

- 1.44 The physical environment in the segregation unit was basic but adequate for its main function of holding prisoners waiting for transfers back to closed conditions. The six cells were clean and all had integral sanitation but toilets were insufficiently screened.
- 1.45 All prisoners located in the segregation unit were inappropriately subject to a strip search, (see section on security). Seventy-four of the 93 prisoners located there in 2010 and nine of the 12 so far in 2011 were held for transfers back. Others were held for reasons such as returning to the prison under the influence of alcohol when they might stay there overnight. When health care staff were not on duty to complete the safety screen, observations of prisoners were maintained at a higher level until that could be done. The longest stay had been for 22 hours but most were for much shorter periods. Documentation authorising segregation was not always well completed to fully justify its use.

Housekeeping points

- 1.46 Toilets in cells in the segregation unit should be appropriately screened.
- 1.47 Documentation authorising segregation should be fully completed and justify the reasons for segregation.

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.48 Prisoners under the integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) could be accepted but demand was likely to be very low and we questioned whether the investment was justified. The substance misuse strategy was well managed and service provision was based on need. Prisoners, including those with alcohol problems, had good access to a wide range of support services, many of which were co-delivered with community providers.
- 1.49 Additional resources had been provided to implement the IDTS, and the prison was now able to accept prisoners on substitute opiate regimes. There were appropriate clinical management and joint working protocols, a treatment room for the safe administration of controlled drugs and specialist clinical staff had been appointed. Nursing resources to provide specialist clinical services at Kirklevington were currently based at the neighbouring local prison but the service

could be set up at Kirklevington with four weeks' notice. The need for the service was likely to be very low, and we questioned its role and usefulness in such a prison where it would not be unreasonable to expect men no longer to have any substance dependency.

- 1.50 The head of health services was a nurse prescriber and all nurses had been trained in smoking cessation, so prisoners had good help to stop smoking.
- 1.51 New arrivals were informed about blood-borne viruses and the need for hepatitis B vaccination or boosters was established during their second health care screening. Hepatitis C screening and HIV testing took place at the prison or in the community, and health services staff had been trained in pre- and post-test counselling. There were good links with community resources (such as Teesside Positive Action) and patients could easily access specialist treatment at the local hospital clinic.
- 1.52 A multidisciplinary committee met regularly to monitor and implement strategy initiatives, and there were strong links with community planning bodies and services. Detailed population needs assessments informed the strategy and gaps in services were actively addressed.
- 1.53 Prisoners were very appreciative of the CARATs service and in our survey, an impressive 100% said the help they received for their drug and/or alcohol problem was useful. CARAT services were provided by 1.5-equivalent senior practitioners from Phoenix Futures and a designated officer. Staff were skilled, experienced and highly motivated. The officer was a core member of the team but he wore prison uniform, which was inappropriate for his role. There was an open door policy, including for those with alcohol problems and staff delivered bi-weekly induction input which included harm reduction information. Prisoners were assessed promptly and at May 2011, 23 actively engaged with the service; a further 55 files had been suspended.
- 1.54 Interventions included structured one-to-one work supplemented by work packs, the full range of short IDTS modules, and six-session modules focusing on relapse prevention, harm minimisation and motivational enhancement. Weekly auricular acupuncture sessions were popular.
- 1.55 Prisoners with alcohol problems could participate in an alcohol recovery group, which was facilitated by a community alcohol worker and CARATs. Peer-led Narcotics Anonymous groups met weekly. CARATs also actively engaged with ex-servicemen who had misused substances.

Housekeeping point

- 1.56 The counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) officer should not wear the same uniform as discipline staff.

Good practice

- 1.57 *Prisoners with drugs and/or alcohol problems could access a wide range of interventions, many of which were co-delivered with community service providers, and there was positive service user feedback on the help they received.*

Section 2: Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners live in a safe, clean and decent environment within which they are encouraged to take personal responsibility for themselves and their possessions.

- 2.1 All men had single rooms and all areas of the prison were clean and well maintained. Prisoners had good laundry facilities and could shower daily and in private but some showers did not work well. The application system was effective. Most telephones could be used in private.
- 2.2 The grounds were well maintained and attractive. All rooms were single, which prisoners appreciated and looked after and for which they had their own keys.
- 2.3 Older accommodation attached to the main prison building had shared toilet and shower facilities. Prisoners on these units shared a large well equipped association room. There was also a small gym with exercise and weight training equipment. Three of the newer units were separate from the main prison building, had en-suite facilities and provided a higher standard of accommodation for prisoners working outside the prison. Each of these units had an association room and a separate television room.
- 2.4 All accommodation was generally well maintained across all units and prisoners' rooms and communal areas were clean, even though fewer than the comparator in our survey said they could get cleaning materials weekly. All units had small kitchen areas with water boilers, toasters and microwaves but there were no further facilities to enable prisoners to self-cater.
- 2.5 All prisoners could shower daily and in private but there were many complaints about the unreliable temperature and water pressure. An ongoing problem with toilets on the ground floor of K unit meant they were frequently blocked. Prisoners wore their own clothes and those on the main units could have their clothes laundered twice weekly in the D wing laundry. Other units had small laundries.
- 2.6 Consultation meetings gave prisoners the opportunity to raise accommodation issues, and a monthly newsletter had recently been introduced to update prisoners on residential matters.
- 2.7 New arrivals were told about the application process during their induction, and prisoners were encouraged to raise matters with officers first to try to resolve them. Application forms were freely available and logged on request but not return. Prisoners in our survey were very satisfied with the applications system.
- 2.8 There were sufficient telephones on units and most could be used in private.

Recommendation

- 2.9 Ongoing problems with the water pressure, shower temperature and the toilets on K wing should be rectified.

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are treated respectfully by staff throughout the duration of their sentence, and are encouraged to take full responsibility for their own actions and decisions.

- 2.10 Relationships between staff and prisoners were generally good. Consultation arrangements were effective and prisoners were encouraged to take responsibility for their own decisions and actions. Prisoners knew their personal officers and most had a reasonably good relationship with them.
- 2.11 In our survey, more than the comparator said that staff treated them with respect and that they had a member of staff they could turn to for help. Some prisoners in groups said a small number of officers could be unhelpful but we saw only courteous and friendly engagement between staff and prisoners, and prisoners often commented that staff were 'exceptional' or 'helpful'. Staff modelled and expected appropriate standards of behaviour, and constructively challenged prisoners. First or preferred names were widely used.
- 2.12 Good consultation arrangements led to changes and gave prisoners confidence that their views were taken into account. Prisoners were encouraged to take responsibility for their actions and decisions, such as completing induction, recording their progress in their 'green files' (see below) and reporting the need for minor repairs on units.
- 2.13 A clear personal officer job description explained what was required of officers each of whom had a caseload of around 12-13 prisoners, with a back-up officer. In our survey, 98% said they had a personal officer, against the comparator of 64%, and a high proportion said they were helpful.
- 2.14 Personal officers were expected to use the 'green files' to record engagement with prisoners. We reviewed 42 files and found a lack of entries by personal officers in most. Those that were completed were usually less frequent than the expected monthly contribution and lacked useful detail. What quality assurance arrangements there were had been ineffective in bringing about improvements. The governor provided constructive comments, which prisoners appreciated. Despite the lack of comments, most prisoners said they had a reasonable relationship with their personal officer.

Recommendation

- 2.15 Personal officers should make regular entries in prisoners' files commenting on progress in meeting resettlement objectives, family issues and other relevant matters.

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating all forms of discrimination and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each equality strand are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religious

tolerance, disability (including mental and physical disabilities, and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender (including transgender issues), sexual orientation and age.

2.16 Diversity was well-led by the governor with active work across all aspects under a single equality scheme. Good attention was paid to ethnic monitoring and other areas of diversity were also monitored but not as systematically. Incident reports received appropriate responses. Equality was well-promoted and there were active prisoner diversity representatives. The equality scheme also covered ex-servicemen who received good support. Although outcomes were good, black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners had some poorer perceptions in our survey about treatment by staff. There were no foreign national prisoners, the reasons for which needed examination. Staff had good awareness of religious diversity issues. There was some effective support for men with disabilities. There was good consultation with older men.

Strategic management

- 2.17 The equality officer regularly checked figures for transfers, complaints, paid work, attendance and religious services to assess any unequal treatment, as well as conditions for prisoners who were ex-servicemen. The NOMS short-term monitoring tool was not used, which would have enabled more effective interpretation of these figures.
- 2.18 SMART (systematic monitoring and analysing of race equality treatment) ethnic monitoring was thorough and discussed at equality meetings and in consultative meetings with black and minority ethnic prisoners with outcomes displayed in the prison. Any apparent anomalies were investigated. The equality officer also regularly monitored equality of treatment by religion, and the figures were considered at the equality meeting.
- 2.19 Racist incident report forms had been changed to discrimination incident report forms, covering all aspects of equality, and were freely available. Stockton Riverside College had a satisfactory mutual arrangement with the prison to scrutinise each other's incident reports.
- 2.20 The governor took an active lead in diversity matters and there were enthusiastic lead staff for every diversity strand. A single equality scheme covered all areas of equality in compliance with the Equality Act 2010, and included a local policy on foreign nationals. A further strand, veterans in custody, had been added. A whole-prison needs assessment had been carried out within the previous 12 months. Senior managers had prioritised equality impact assessments.
- 2.21 A prisoner equality meeting, chaired by the governor and with a large multidisciplinary attendance, including prisoner representatives, met bi-monthly. Matters raised were acted on, and issues from consultation meetings with black and minority ethnic and with older prisoners were brought to the meeting. There were six equality representatives from all sections of the population. Their names and photographs were widely displayed (although the list and photographs in the large association room were out of date).
- 2.22 An annual diversity fortnight featured a good range of events across most strands of diversity and there were good displays promoting equality. The equality officer had devised an effective presentation for black history month, which had been celebrated through a range of events. Awareness of disabilities issues was raised by periodic wheelchair rugby demonstrations. Two prominent notice boards on the main corridor promoted equality for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people with details of a local support group which prisoners could attend

on town visits. Equality for Gypsy, Romany and Traveller groups was also promoted although no prisoners chose to identify themselves as such.

- 2.23 Regular support and consultation groups for black and minority ethnic prisoners and for older prisoners were run. Similar forums had been proposed for other groups but had not attracted any interest. The black and minority ethnic consultative meeting was usually held quarterly. Attendance was generally good, but only one prisoner had attended the most recent meeting, as it had clashed with the gym programme. Some issues were repeated in three consecutive meetings. The older prisoners' group, run by prisoners, was well attended and included two representatives from Age UK.
- 2.24 A well-established 'veterans in custody support' group for ex-forces men had given practical help to over 30 men in the last year. Strong partnerships had been built with external organisations able to help, especially with accommodation and other resettlement issues.
- 2.25 Links had been established with Middlesbrough Community Cohesion Partnership, and with the black and minority ethnic coordinating group of about 100 organisations in the Middlesbrough area. There were active links with a number of regional disability agencies, including Doncaster College for the Deaf.
- 2.26 To date, 61% of staff had completed the Prison Service 'challenge it change it' diversity training package, and all were scheduled for it by the end of 2011. Dyslexia awareness training had been delivered to staff as part of the 2010 diversity fortnight. A speaker from Kameleon Transgender had delivered an awareness session to staff.

Equality and diversity strands

- 2.27 Almost 20% of prisoners were from black and minority ethnic groups. In our survey, their perceptions were mostly similar to those of white prisoners, except that considerably more (25% against 7%) said they had felt threatened or intimidated by staff and more said they had been victimised by staff because of their race or religion. There were only three staff from a black and minority ethnic background, which led some black and minority ethnic prisoners to perceive the establishment as dominated by the perspectives of white people. Three staff had completed training as race equality officers, two of whom regularly carried out this role.
- 2.28 There had been only 13 reported racist incidents in the previous year, nine of which had related to unattributable repeated graffiti. Management responses had been robust, but the recurrence suggested a need for the expression of extreme views to be addressed in education in the diversity programme. One prisoner who had been found to have used racist language was dealt with appropriately with some equality education as well as through the disciplinary system
- 2.29 The equality officer was notified of any prisoners with a racial element to their offending, and a list was maintained, which was available to all staff on the shared drive.
- 2.30 No foreign national prisoners had been received in the previous year, other than a prisoner with dual nationality and an EU citizen. This was due to a lack of applicants rather than any screening out by the prison. It was likely that there would be foreign nationals resettling in the UK, and who would benefit from the regime, but it was possible that delays in the risk assessment and decision-making processes in the UK Border Agency hindered applications from foreign nationals with sufficient time left to serve.

- 2.31 In our survey, more black and minority ethnic and Muslim respondents than others said that they had been victimised because of their religion or religious beliefs. Although Muslim respondents did not give significantly different answers from non-Muslims generally, more said that they had been victimised or threatened or intimidated by a member of staff at Kirklevington. The reasons for this were not clear, and staff we spoke to showed awareness of religious diversity and its complex relation with cultural and ethnic identities. The specific needs of all main religious groups were met (see section on faith and religious activity).
- 2.32 There was committed work to support prisoners with disabilities, led by well trained disability liaison officer (DLO) and assistant DLO. The DLO spoke to all prisoners individually on induction, showed a DVD, and held a regular drop-in session in the prisoner information room. Personal emergency and evacuation plans for two prisoners identified as needing them were held in the communications room. New arrivals were asked in reception about any disabilities but not in sufficient confidentiality. There was no dedicated accommodation for prisoners with physical disabilities but a room had been identified ready for use in such a case and there was reasonable access to most areas. A wheelchair user was currently being considered for transfer and managers were confident that there would be sufficient time between acceptance of a prisoner with physical disabilities and the actual transfer to allow appropriate adjustments to be made. The DLOs liaised well with health care staff and also with the education team for prisoners identified with learning difficulties. Two portable hearing loops were available. There was no formal carer scheme but there were adequate arrangements for the one prisoner who currently needed some support.
- 2.33 Although no prisoner currently wished to identify himself as gay or bisexual, the leader of this strand took consistent and positive action to promote respect for all sexualities. In the past year, two gay prisoners had identified themselves with none but positive outcomes.
- 2.34 In our survey, older prisoners mostly shared the same perceptions as others across almost all aspects of a prison life. Over-50s gym sessions had recently been introduced with good take up. Older prisoners had requested that they be accommodated in specific areas and two wings had been identified in response. Although this very rarely applied, and there were no retired prisoners at the time of the inspection, retirement pay was too low at £3.50 a week, out of which £1 had to be paid for a television.

Recommendations

- 2.35 **The prison should take action, in consultation with regional staff and the UK Border Agency, to encourage applications from foreign national prisoners likely to be released in the UK.**
- 2.36 **Muslim prisoners and staff should be consulted to identify and address reasons for Muslim prisoners' poor perception of their treatment by staff.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.37 The NOMS short-term monitoring tool should be used to trace patterns and trends in equality areas outside the scope of the SMART tool.
- 2.38 All lists and photographs of staff and prisoners with diversity roles should be kept up to date.

- 2.39 A programme of prisoner education should address the boundaries between expression of acceptable political views and unacceptable extremism.

Good practice

- 2.40 *Diversity strand leads continued to offer individual and group support for minority groups, even though there had been little or no take up to date.*
- 2.41 *The well-established work supporting ex-forces men had given real help to many and had built strong partnerships with external organisations able to assist, especially with accommodation and other resettlement issues.*

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.42 The chaplaincy played a full part in the prison's resettlement role. Worship and pastoral care provision was sufficient for most religions. There were strong links with outside faith communities, which provided some useful community work and educational visits.
- 2.43 Prisoners of most faiths had access to regular services. Chaplains had maintained a good service since the recent departure of the full-time chaplain. There was no chaplaincy presence on Saturdays but many prisoners were out of the prison and on-call arrangements were satisfactory.
- 2.44 The religious programme was well and widely advertised. There was provision for all main faiths in the prison, with a Sikh chaplain covering the needs of both Sikhs and Hindus. The chaplaincy tracked the population profile and shaped provision accordingly.
- 2.45 A 'faith and peace centre' was well equipped and the prayer room in the main building had been substantially improved with carpet and prayer mats, displays, audio equipment, storage and artefacts for worship.
- 2.46 Classes and other sessions were provided weekly on an interdenominational basis, as well as specific Christian and Muslim teaching sessions.
- 2.47 Ramadan had been well facilitated, and explained to any prisoner interested. The feast of Eid ul-Fitr had included non-Muslims, and the Sikh festival of Baisakhi had similarly been used to share food with the wider community. There were imaginative attempts to draw a wide range of staff and prisoners into exploration of spirituality, including the Holocaust memorial day inter-faith observance, as well as the Prayer Tree event near Christmas-time, and a regular 'spirituality through art' class.
- 2.48 The chaplaincy made full use of the opportunities for release on temporary licence to arrange visits to faith centres and to liaise with resettlement colleagues in providing prisoner working parties to many local faith communities. This included the recent completion of an ambitious project to completely restore the historic interior of Yarm Methodist church.

- 2.49 The chaplaincy made a strong contribution to maintaining family ties, including providing practical and emotional support to men who needed to make special or urgent contact with family. The faith and peace centre was also used for bereavement counselling provided by Cruse. Chaplains engaged fully with most aspects of prison life, including personal support, risk management, sentence planning boards and diversity.

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

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

2.50 Relatively few formal written complaints were made and some prisoners said they would not complain in case of repercussions. Responses to complaints were generally appropriate but quality assurance measures had lapsed.

2.51 Prisoners were encouraged to resolve issues informally or with their personal officer in the first instance. Some issues were resolved by informal approach to the governor, who was very visible in the prison. Prisoners used the complaint system infrequently with only 66 complaints submitted in 2010-11. During the inspection, a number of prisoners told us that would not make complaints in case this put their place at Kirklevington in jeopardy. We found no evidence to support this view.

2.52 Complaint forms were freely accessible. The responses to complaints we sampled were generally polite and timely but not all were addressed personally to the prisoner. Most covered the issues raised but some displayed a lack of empathy about the situation that led to the prisoner submitting the complaint. Previous quality assurance measures appeared to have lapsed.

Recommendation

2.53 Managers should ensure that prisoners are confident that using the complaint system will not result in repercussions.

Housekeeping point

2.54 Quality assurance of complaints should ensure that prisoners receive helpful and appropriate replies.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

2.55 There was little demand for legal services. The legal services officer had not received training. There was adequate provision for legal visits.

2.56 Most prisoners had no outstanding issues related to their sentence or conviction and there was little demand for legal services. The nominated legal services officer had not received any recent training but the few requests he received were usually just for information about contacting solicitors. If necessary, he sought advice from the legal services department at HMP Holme House.

2.57 Officers explained risk assessments and related licence conditions in the prisoner information centre and this information was reinforced by reception staff before release.

2.58 There were satisfactory arrangements for legal visits.

Housekeeping point

2.59 The legal services officer should receive up-to-date training.

Health services

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are cared for by a health service that assesses and meets their health needs while in prison and which promotes continuity of health and social care on release. The standard of health service provided is equivalent to that which prisoners could expect to receive elsewhere in the community.

2.60 Prisoners expressed exceptional levels of satisfaction with the quality of health care and the respect with which they were treated. Clinical governance and partnership arrangements were sound, supported by a good health needs assessments. The quality of delivery of physical health care at primary and secondary levels, pharmacy and dentistry were all good with no waiting lists. There was an impressive range of options for the treatment of common mental health problems.

Governance arrangements

2.61 Health care provision was informed by a comprehensive 2010 health needs assessment. Services were commissioned by County Durham NHS Primary Care Trust (PCT) and provided by Care UK which had only recently taken over the contract. Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys NHS Foundation Trust provided secondary mental health in-reach team (MHIRT) support.

2.62 There were regular well-attended partnership board meetings and patient safety and quality meetings monitored and discussed clinical governance and performance. The department of prison health performance and quality indicators self-assessment had been completed in 2011 and there was an associated action plan.

- 2.63 A patient consultative committee met regularly and a recent patient health satisfaction survey was very positive. No prisoner had made a formal written complaint about health care in the previous two years.
- 2.64 A senior nurse was the health care manager and there were two registered nurses and nursing assistants and administrative support staff. Clinical staff members' registration and mandatory training details were in date and recorded. Staff had good access to advanced training and clinical supervision.
- 2.65 Evidence-based clinical reference materials, including those issued by the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE), were used, as were copies of relevant national service frameworks. Patient treatment plans reflected the evidence base and a sample of records and treatment plans was audited monthly.
- 2.66 Care UK policies were available but staff were not yet familiar with them. The policy on infection control was past the review date and too general with no guidance on local action required for a communicable disease outbreak and a policy for safeguarding vulnerable adults did not give the local authority contact details. There was no information sharing protocol. Some other policies were out of date or not relevant to the services provided.
- 2.67 The health centre building resembled a community health centre and was regularly cleaned. An infection control audit in February 2011 had demonstrated 99% compliance with required standards.
- 2.68 Appropriate and regularly checked emergency resuscitation equipment and a drugs pack was kept in the health centre along with an automated external defibrillator (AED). There were also AEDs in the control room, gymnasium and L wing office. One in the external works area had been withdrawn, but this decision was being reviewed. One in 10 operational staff had been trained in the use of AEDs as had just under 5% of prisoners. An independent audit of resuscitation equipment and preparedness for its use had been undertaken by the North East NHS Ambulance Trust in April 2010 and the prison was addressing its recommendations.
- 2.69 The health care manager was the health lead for older prisoners and staff had been appropriately trained. Occupational therapy equipment could be provided for men requiring assistance with mobility and health aids.
- 2.70 There was a health promotion action group in the prison and health promotion literature was freely available in the health centre, but there was little on the wings. There had been several health promotion events with visiting agencies. Condoms were available at reception and from the health centre.

Recommendation

- 2.71 Policies and procedures, which should include an information sharing protocol, should be relevant, within review date, pertinent to the local health and social care environment, and with local contact details as appropriate.

Good practice

- 2.72 *Attention to detail in infection control compliance and to regular cleaning provided prisoners with a very low risk of health centre acquired infections.*

- 2.73 *The training of prisoners in the use of automated external defibrillators provided collateral support for staff and enabled prisoners to acquire useful skills.*
- 2.74 *The independent audit of resuscitation equipment and preparedness helped the men focus on a high risk area and provided a clear rationale for developments and improvements.*

Delivery of care (physical)

- 2.75 In our survey, almost every prisoner said the quality of health services was good or very good (99% against the comparator of 67%). Prisoners said that they felt respected and treated as well as patients in local health centres.
- 2.76 Health care staff participated in the pre-admission assessment of prisoners to ensure where necessary the prison could provide continuity of care. New arrivals were seen by a registered nurse and a reception health screen was used to determine immediate health needs. The prisoner was invited to sign a consent form to acquire and share health-related information with his GP and other relevant agencies. Within three days, a secondary health assessment was held.
- 2.77 Primary care services were available from 8am to 6pm on weekdays, extended until 7pm on Tuesday, and prisoners could attend or telephone the health centre at any time during the day to make appointments.
- 2.78 The range of primary care clinics included nurse-led drop-in clinics each morning and on Tuesday evening, GP surgeries each morning and a variety of treatment clinics in the afternoon, including dressings and genitourinary medicine. Triage was used in the drop-in clinics, although triage algorithms were not used.
- 2.79 Age-related screening for the under-25s and over-50s included chlamydia screening and well man consultations respectively. National screening programmes were followed for the general population and there were active immunisation programmes. Treatment for hepatitis C was available. Lifelong conditions, such as asthma and diabetes, were monitored and treated individually. There were no waiting lists to see doctors, nurses or opticians. The rare cases where prisoners did not attend appointments were followed up. Out-of-hours GP services were provided.
- 2.80 SystmOne (electronic clinical records) was used and patient records were comprehensive although the care planning and template functions were underused, particularly for prisoners with lifelong conditions. Clinical records were used and stored appropriately. There was a protocol for information sharing between health care and the CARAT team.

Recommendation

- 2.81 **Triage algorithms should be used to assist nurses to make informed clinical decisions.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.82 The care planning and template functions of SystmOne should be used more widely for prisoners with lifelong conditions.

Pharmacy

- 2.83 Pharmacy services were provided by a local pharmacy. The pharmacist did not visit the prison although prisoners could telephone for advice. There were no pharmacist-led clinics or medication reviews and the pharmacist was not represented on the medicines and therapeutic committee. Arrangements for ordering and receiving medication were efficient and prisoners were able to order repeat prescriptions.
- 2.84 Medicines requiring refrigeration storage were stored appropriately, although there were occasional gaps on the temperature record chart. Other medicines were stored in a separate fridge as the room temperature was often above that recommended for storing medicines. Subject to risk assessment most prisoners were given monthly supplies of medication.
- 2.85 The anaphylaxis kit was regularly checked. Out-of-date and discontinued medications were sent back to the pharmacy. Prescriptions were stored in a locked filing cabinet. Pharmacy reference materials were up-to-date.
- 2.86 New arrivals received a pack containing a range of simple medicines, such as paracetamol and indigestion tablets. There were only two patient group directions - for the administration and supply of paracetamol and ibuprofen

Recommendation

- 2.87 The pharmacist should visit the prison periodically to check systems and provide clinical audit and medication reviews.

Housekeeping points

- 2.88 Further patient group directions should be developed to enable nurses to supply more potent medication and avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor.
- 2.89 All medicines should be stored at appropriate temperatures with maximum/minimum temperatures recorded daily for the drug refrigerators to ensure that heat-sensitive items are stored within the 2- 8°C range.

Dentistry

- 2.90 In our survey, respondents expressed very high satisfaction with the quality of dental services (91% against the comparator of 57%).
- 2.91 A full range of treatments was provided and there were no waiting lists. Most prisoners used a local community dentistry surgery, which also provided an out-of-hours service. Prisoners unable to leave the prison had treatment at a well equipped PCT mobile dental surgery based in the prison.

Secondary care

- 2.92 Prisoners requiring secondary care, diagnostics and treatment attended the general hospitals in Middlesbrough and Stockton. Appointments for prisoners who required an escort were rarely

impeded by security. The health centre had telemedicine facilities, linked to Airedale General Hospital, but the equipment was rarely used.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.93 There was a clear pathway for referring and treating prisoners with both common and more serious mental health problems. Some staff, including uniformed officers, had received training to recognise and take appropriate action for prisoners with mental health problems.
- 2.94 There was an impressive range of primary mental care support for prisoners with common mental health problems, and no waiting lists. This included self-help books from health care and the library; the Beating the Blues computer program; Cruse bereavement and loss counselling via the chaplaincy; mental health support from Mind; workers from Jigsaw (support for victims of sexual abuse); individual emotional support from primary care nurses; and access to community IAPT (improving access to psychological therapies) services if appropriate.
- 2.95 There were no prisoners with serious and enduring mental health problems at the time of our inspection but there was a suitable protocol for referral in conjunction with HMP Holme House.

Good practice

- 2.96 *The relevance, availability and extent of support and therapy options for prisoners with common mental health problems was impressive and ensured they had access to appropriate care to help manage their conditions.*

Catering

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements and food is prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations.

- 2.97 Prisoners were very positive about food quality and choice but they had no opportunity to cook for themselves. The kitchen and servery were well maintained and managed. Prisoners ate together in a dining room.
- 2.98 Prisoners chose their meals 24 hours in advance from a four-week menu cycle that catered for all dietary and religious needs and included sufficient healthy options. The food we sampled was very good. Prisoners ate together in a large dining room next to the kitchen, using ceramic crockery and metal utensils rather than the plastic items usually provided. There were satisfactory consultation arrangements.
- 2.99 In the survey, 79% of respondents said the food was good, against the comparator of only 37%, although this had dropped from 95% in 2005. The budget of £2.10 per prisoner per day, had not increased for some years. All goods now had to be purchased through centrally negotiated contracts, which precluded the opportunity to take advantage of offers from local suppliers.

- 2.100 Meals were served at appropriate times and included an early serving of breakfast and a late evening meal for those working outside the prison. Prisoners returning later could have plated meals to reheat. Packed lunches were provided for outworkers.
- 2.101 All units had small kitchen areas with water boilers, toasters and microwaves but there were no additional facilities, such as ovens or hobs, to enable prisoners to cook more extensively and help prepare for release.
- 2.102 The kitchen was clean and well managed. Servery workers were health screened, had received food hygiene training and were appropriately dressed. Prisoners were able to gain national vocational qualifications (NVOs) while working in the kitchen.

Recommendation

- 2.103 Prisoners should have additional facilities to cook for themselves.

Shop

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.104 There was good access to the shop. Most prisoners were satisfied with the range of goods but black and ethnic minority prisoners were less so.
- 2.105 Prisoners had weekly access to the shop. Orders were distributed on Wednesday evenings and prisoners working out could authorise other prisoners to collect their items.
- 2.106 In our survey, more than the comparator said that the shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs. Only 50% of black and minority ethnic respondents said so, compared with 67% of white prisoners but this had not been raised as an issue at consultation meetings. There were quarterly opportunities to change items on the shop list through consultation with wing representatives. Meetings were held every quarter but not minuted.
- 2.107 There was no opportunity for prisoners to shop from catalogues although they could arrange to bring back items back from home leaves and following town visits. They could order magazines and newspapers.

Housekeeping points

- 2.108 Shop provision should be an agreed item at the consultation meetings with black and minority ethnic prisoners.
- 2.109 Decisions made at shop consultative meetings should be recorded.

Section 3: Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in out of cell activities, and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied extramural activities.

- 3.1 Prisoners could spend most of their time out of their rooms and had free movement around most areas of the prison.
- 3.2 Prisoners were able to spend most of their time out of their rooms. The main core day started at 7.30am with a roll check and prisoners were not required to return to their rooms until 10.30pm during the week and midnight at the weekend. There was no prisoner movement into or out of the prison between midnight and 5am but they could take up employment out of the prison outside these times.
- 3.3 Prisoners had free movement around the prison with roll checks in the dining room at noon and 5pm. No prisoners were unemployed and there was a range of recreational facilities for use in the evenings and at weekends.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.4 There were sufficient places to engage all prisoners in purposeful activity with an impressive number of prisoners in paid or unpaid work and education in the community. Community work projects had a commendable focus on restorative justice principles. Activities were clearly aimed at developing personal and employability skills to support resettlement. Pass rates were high on most vocational training courses and there were excellent links with external providers for further training opportunities. The education department ran a good range of programmes with high pass rates and good teaching and learning. Prisoners received very good individualised support and there was effective help for prisoners with additional learning needs. The library service was satisfactory but there was no internet access.

Management of learning and skills

- 3.5 The prison had a very clear strategic direction that effectively supported resettlement. The learning and skills provision was based on an analysis of prison population needs and skills demands in prisoners' resettlement areas. Particularly effective working with external partners

provided prisoners with a wide range of employment, education and training opportunities. The prison made good use of quality assurance to drive improvements, and had implemented highly effective actions to enable prisoners to recognise and attain their potential. The collection and analysis of data for performance management were effective. However, in a small number of areas the prison did not use data sufficiently to evaluate the impact of initiatives. All staff were appropriately qualified and experienced.

Recommendation

- 3.6 The prison should further develop the use of learning and skills data to evaluate fully the impact of initiatives.

Capacity to improve

- 3.7 Since the previous inspection, the prison had addressed all significant weaknesses identified and increased the breadth, variety and quality of its provision. Strategic and operational working between the prison and learning, skills and work partners was outstanding. The prison had successfully matched its improved purposeful activities provision to meet resettlement needs and on improvement initiatives that prepared prisoners for release. Outcomes for prisoners were good and showed a consistently improving trend.
- 3.8 Senior managers made good use of strategic target setting and monitoring to implement improvement. The prison had taken great care to establish a culture that valued and expected consistently high performance from staff and prisoners while encouraging feedback on the success of achieving its priorities. A recent organisational restructuring had prepared the prison to meet future challenges. The prison carefully deployed resources to maximise value for money. Workshops were of a good commercial standard. Investment in new facilities, including a computer-based 'virtual learning environment', had further improved the quality of the learners' experience.
- 3.9 Quality assurance processes were good and well used to inform action planning leading to high quality sustained improvement. The prison effectively sought and used feedback to inform actions for improvement. The self-assessment process was well established and used very effectively as an improvement tool. The associated report accurately reflected the judgements and grades given by Ofsted inspectors.

Provision of activities

- 3.10 There were sufficient purposeful activity places to fully occupy prisoners. Activities were well focused on developing personal and employability skills to support successful resettlement. All places were available part-time. Allocation to activities was fair and adequately took into account prisoners' preferences and sentence plan targets. The prison managed waiting lists satisfactorily and kept an accurate register of each prisoner's daily activity. Punctuality and attendance were good for vocational workshops in the prison and satisfactory for other provision.
- 3.11 Within the prison, 194 full-time-equivalent places were available, of which 22 were in classroom-based education provided by The Manchester College. Education classes ran from 9am to 11.30am and from 1.30pm to 4.30pm over four and a half days. Evening provision was

also offered from 5.30pm to 7.45pm on three evenings. At the time of the inspection, a further 13 prisoners were participating in distance or Open University learning.

- 3.12 There were 87 full-time-equivalent vocational training in a range of disciplines, including catering, cleaning, domestic appliance refurbishment, horticulture, waste management and welding. Prison staff delivered a further 12 land-based full-time-equivalent vocational training places.
- 3.13 The prison's 73 full-time-equivalent work places included work as cleaners, caterers, gardeners, and grounds and building maintenance. There were 22 orderly positions in the gym, stores, library, laundry, dining room, reception and visitors' centre. The prison also provided 12 taskforce places for local community project work.
- 3.14 A commendably high number of prisoners were engaged in paid and unpaid activities outside the prison. Typically, there were 65 external community placements, as well as 40-60 paid employment places. The prison vetted employers used for work experience and paid employment and also checked that there were safe working practices and appropriate rates of pay. Community projects had a good focus on restorative justice principles, and the prison had estimated their value, based on minimum wage rates, at over £600,000 a year. There were, additionally, around 60 part-time places with local further education and adult and community providers. An average of six prisoners attended short externally delivered vocational programmes.
- 3.15 New arrivals received a thorough induction relevant for resettlement. A4e provided careers information and advice support (CIAS). The service effectively identified and recorded prisoners' future paths towards agreed goals. Assessments of prisoners' literacy, numeracy and wider personal needs were accurate and appropriately addressed.

Quality of provision

- 3.16 Individual coaching in vocational training was good and instructional officers had a detailed commercial understanding of their areas. There were good links with functional skills tutors, with well-integrated projects. Sound health and safety practice was well emphasised. External colleges carried out appropriate assessment of much of the vocational work and provided internal verification. Tracking and monitoring of progress was clear and learners received frequent and effective informal progress reviews. However, this process did not fully use and record formalised learning targets.
- 3.17 Learners benefited from good teaching and learning methods and resources in education sessions. Learning was interactive and the pace was challenging in most sessions. Staff used the outcomes of initial literacy and numeracy assessments to produce detailed individual learning plans. Learning targets were specific and measurable and used very well. Support for prisoners in classes was very effective in monitoring and promoting learning.
- 3.18 The vocational training provision met the needs and interests of prisoners well. Opportunities for progression were good and learners were able to move from low to higher-level qualifications by attending external colleges. Courses had clear links to the external labour market and employment in prisoners' release areas. A good range of relevant accredited programmes in education and through external courses were available. The range of courses in the education department was increased significantly through external provision and in 2010/11, 54 prisoners progressed to a wide range of higher-level accredited courses with external providers.

- 3.19 Community work projects were well coordinated, linking with 33 different providers to provide good and varied work experience. The prison used a system to recognise and record progress and achievement of social and personal work skills where there was no other formal accreditation. However, employers were not sufficiently involved in assessing progress. Many prisoners attended vocational training courses at external colleges linked to their paid employment.
- 3.20 Internal and external partnerships in education were strong. Links between education and CIAS were particularly good at ensuring a clear focus on gaining qualifications and training for resettlement. Partnerships with a wide range of colleges, local authorities and distance learning providers significantly benefited prisoners.
- 3.21 The prison used well-focused training sessions to prepare prisoners for the challenges of working and attending training outside. Support for prisoners in education was highly individualised and very good but sometimes men had to wait too long for laptops needed for external courses. CIAS was very effective in directing prisoners to the most appropriate courses, developing a comprehensive plan for resettlement. Feedback from prisoners was very positive about the induction and support, the speed of allocation to courses and help received in developing their career pathway. Support for prisoners with additional learning needs was particularly effective. The 'hidden difficulties' questionnaire was used very effectively to identify specific support needs. The education timetable had been amended to provide support sessions for those identified with such needs. A comprehensive dyslexia specialist assessment had been completed for one prisoner and appropriate adjustments were made to meet the needs of dyslexic learners.

Recommendations

- 3.22 **The prison should work with employers to improve their involvement in target setting.**
- 3.23 **Prisoners attending external courses should receive timely access to computers needed for course work.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.24 Pass rates in education and vocational training were high on most courses. Different groups achieved to the same level and at a similar rate. Learners attending vocational training developed a good work ethic and enjoyed their learning. They developed confidence and self-esteem and could see how their skills development enhanced employment prospects. There was good development of independent learning skills. The standard of welding in particular was high and often above that required by the qualification.
- 3.25 In 2010/11, pass rates were high for literacy levels 1 and 2, numeracy level 1 and level 2 qualifications in health and safety, first aid and food safety. Pass rates for horticulture courses were satisfactory. The rates for numeracy level 2 declined from 58% in 2009/10 to a low of 50% in 2010/11 but a strategy had been developed to improve retention and pass rates on this course. Prisoners enjoyed their sessions and made good gains in developing their confidence, ability to interact in groups and communication skills. Standards of work were good overall. Attendance rates at education sessions were satisfactory and exceptionally good at workshops, at around 98%. There were high levels of mutual respect between learners and staff.

Recommendation

- 3.26 The prison should fully implement and monitor the strategy for improving pass rates in numeracy at level 2.

Library

- 3.27 All prisoners received an adequate library induction. The prison used the outcomes of a prison-wide library survey to plan the library provision. The library was small but adequate and opening hours were satisfactory but there was no weekend opening. The library stock included a reasonable selection of fiction, non-fiction, education and vocational training books. A satisfactory range of newspapers, CDs, DVDs and easy reading texts were available. The library offered appropriate access to the current Prison Service Orders and up-to-date legal practitioner texts. Prisoners and library staff had inadequate access to internet material.

Recommendations

- 3.28 Prisoners and library staff should have appropriate access to the internet.

Ofsted judgements on learning and skills and work activities

- 3.29 As part of the whole inspection Ofsted inspectors make assessments of the learning and skills provision in prisons against Ofsted's Common Inspection Framework which form part of our activities expectations. These Ofsted assessments focus on the quality of what is delivered and contribute towards the overall assessments in the area of purposeful activity. Ofsted made the following assessments about the learning and skills provision at Kirklevington:

Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work	Good
Quality of learning and skills and work provisions	Good
Leadership and management of learning and skills and work	Good
Capacity to make further improvements in learning and skills and work	Outstanding

Physical education and healthy living

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.30 Promotion of prisoners' understanding of healthy living and personal fitness was good. Prisoners had good access to a wide range of sports and PE facilities. The range of programmes was good, and pass rates were high.

- 3.31 Health and well-being was well promoted and prisoners had a good appreciation of the benefits of regular gym use and adopting a healthy life style. All prisoners attended a detailed induction that explained the safe use of equipment, and also emphasised the dangers of steroids use. Healthy eating, weight reduction and smoking cessation were well promoted in the gym and a small treatment room was used effectively to monitor blood pressure, cholesterol levels and body mass index.
- 3.32 PE staff were made aware of any health conditions and guidance on limiting vigorous exercise. At the PE induction, all prisoners completed a health-screening questionnaire and any concerns were referred to health care for guidance. Staff used the outcomes of health screening to develop effective individual exercise programmes. Special sessions were provided for men over 50 and representatives from health care and PE attended the monthly older prisoners meeting to provide support and guidance.
- 3.33 There was good access to a wide range of sports and PE facilities. A large sports hall offered a variety of indoor activities and there was an all-weather pitch for five-a-side football and also a sports pitch for football, baseball and jogging. The gym had a range of resistance equipment, including free weights and some cardiovascular equipment. However, this room was cramped when fully used. PE facilities were clean and welcoming
- 3.34 There were effective partnerships with a local football league and community organisations for older people and children with learning difficulties and/or disabilities. The sports hall was used each week to host community involvement events and prisoners took part as part of their induction.
- 3.35 PE staff were well qualified and a suitable range of accredited courses was provided, including a level 2 programme in nutrition, performance and healthy eating, which had high pass rates. During 2010-11, eight prisoners progressed on to level 2 or 3 gym instructor qualifications with partner colleges. One prisoner was making good progress on a foundation degree in sports and management.
- 3.36 Opening times of the gym met the needs of most prisoners, and included three evenings and a Sunday morning session. The fitness suite was open until 10pm on four days and Saturday and Sunday afternoon. However, there was no cover for staff absence and at such times the PE programme was reduced. No staff were based in the fitness suite but PE staff monitored it throughout the day. Data collected on gym use indicated that 63% of prisoners used the PE and fitness facilities. In our survey, 74% of respondents said that they went to the gym at least twice a week, against the comparator of 63%.

Recommendation

- 3.37 Prisoners should have access to PE facilities, including when regular PE staff are absent.

Section 4: Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

Resettlement underpins the work of the whole prison, supported by strategic partnerships in the community and informed by assessment of prisoner risk and need.

- 4.1 A whole prison approach to resettlement was underpinned by a comprehensive resettlement strategy based on a needs analysis. Strategic oversight to develop services was good but more detailed monitoring of outcomes would have helped measure their effectiveness.
- 4.2 There was a good whole-prison approach to resettlement, which was the primary focus of staff and prisoners. A comprehensive strategy for reducing reoffending covered offender management and resettlement services and described the functioning of offender management and outlined services for all resettlement pathways. Each pathway had developmental targets which involved partner organisations. The strategy focused on the specific purpose of the prison to resettle prisoners coming to the end of long sentences whose risk required careful managing as they were prepared for a return to the community. A monthly well attended resettlement strategy group was chaired by the governor. The agenda linked relevant areas of resettlement, offender management and public protection.
- 4.3 A needs analysis had been carried out in June 2010 based on a review of offender assessments (OASys). This had been the first such analysis and it was intended to repeat the exercise every two years. While the needs analysis did not directly incorporate prisoners' views except as expressed in OASys interviews, a governor interviewed every prisoner due for discharge to get their feedback, and the governor used this to inform resettlement services through her role as chair of the resettlement strategy group.
- 4.4 The services described in the strategy were appropriate for the population and included robust management of temporary release (see paragraph 4.15). There was a good emphasis on the development of partnership work.
- 4.5 There was some monitoring of the effectiveness of resettlement services through measurement of key performance targets and reports to the resettlement strategy group. Although outcomes were known, in some areas the impact of the prison's contribution was not clear.

Recommendation

- 4.6 All resettlement pathways and services should be monitored to demonstrate the effectiveness of action taken by the prison in helping successful resettlement outcomes.

Good practice

- 4.7 *Prisoners due for discharge had an interview with the governor to give their views on their experience of the prison, which were used to inform the development of services.*

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.8 Offender management was well organised but a number of assessments were behind schedule. Sentence plans were generally good quality, although some targets were not sufficiently specific. Prisoners were well involved in sentence planning and families were invited to boards. Offender management paid full attention to resettlement needs and there was good liaison with offender managers in the community. Release on temporary licence was used extensively. Home detention curfew arrangements were efficient. Public protection arrangements were effective and proportionate. Offender supervisors for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners were fully trained and there was regular consultation and information sharing with these prisoners.
- 4.9 The head of the offender management unit (OMU) was a seconded probation officer responsible for a team of six fulltime equivalent prison officers, who were also detailed to other duties, two probation officers and a probation service officer.
- 4.10 The unit was well organised and all prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor on arrival. There was a target of eight weeks to complete a review of their OASys but this had not been achieved in 56 cases at the time of the inspection and 31 had not been reviewed in the previous 12 months. Reviews by external offender managers of in-scope cases were up to date.
- 4.11 In our survey, respondents were positive about offender management: a large proportion said that they had a sentence plan, that they had been involved in its development and that they could achieve their targets at the prison.
- 4.12 In the cases we examined, we found good information about the prisoner and the offence but insufficient analysis in some cases. Sentence plans contained appropriate targets, which would be improved by being more specific and outcome-focused, with sequencing of objectives and indicating planned levels of contact.
- 4.13 Information sharing was good both in the prison and with external agencies, including offender managers. Prisoners engaged meaningfully in their sentence planning and it was clear what needed to do to achieve their sentence plan objectives.
- 4.14 All prisoners had a paper contact log in their green files in the prisoner information room to enable information sharing between the prisoner and offender supervisor. Many prisoners made daily entries (particularly during their initial period of assessment) in the style of a personal diary which provided valuable information for the offender supervisor. The files contained frequent entries from offender supervisors, including positive feedback about

progress where appropriate. The governor also made frequent entries but there were insufficient entries from personal officers.

- 4.15 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was an essential part of the regime. ROTL boards were held weekly with contributions from all prison departments. Prisoners were assessed on the basis of their risk with different levels of release. Some had to adhere to a period of 'structure' which meant they could only be allowed out to attend specific timed appointments or work placements. This meant that even those who were not suitable for the full range of temporary release could attend programmes or resettlement appointments.
- 4.16 Offender supervisors routinely took prisoners on escorted visits. In some cases where a local offender manager was unable to attend a sentence planning board at the prison, an escorted ROTL was used to facilitate a meeting at their office.
- 4.17 Home detention curfew arrangements were efficient. All applications were considered in time for their eligibility date. Prisoners without a suitable address could get support from Stonham BASS (bail accommodation and support services) scheme to identify accommodation.
- 4.18 Full attention had been given to promoting community reintegration in all the cases we inspected. The most significant offending-related factors in our sample were thinking, behaviour and attitudes, lifestyle and associates, alcohol misuse, and employment, training and education. Sentence plan objectives had been fully or partly achieved in all cases except two.
- 4.19 Family members were invited to sentence planning boards and in some cases attended.
- 4.20 Support and oversight of staff in the completion of OASys assessments was limited to informal contact, routine countersigning of assessments and national quality assurance arrangements. Some in-house training days were planned. The OMU manager sampled 10% of assessments for feedback.

Recommendation

- 4.21 **Offender assessment system (OASys) assessment reviews should be completed on all prisoners within eight weeks of their arrival.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.22 Offender supervisors should be provided with supervision and feedback on the quality of their work.

Good practice

- 4.23 *Family members attended some sentence planning boards, which helped include them in the work the prisoner needed to do to reduce their risk of reoffending.*

Categorisation

- 4.24 At the time of the inspection, there were 47 category C prisoners and 231 category D. New arrivals retained their previous category.

- 4.25 Each prisoner went through an eight-week period of assessment at the end of which a board considered their suitability for progression through the stages of temporary release and their categorisation taking into account a wide range of information including prisoners' own comments in their green files. The small number of prisoners who did not progress to category D at the eight-week review were given clear reasons and were set targets for their next review after one month.
- 4.26 The prison did not hold prisoners with convictions for sexual offences. The main concern for public protection was the 40% of the population who had convictions for violent offences, including robbery. At the time of the inspection, there were 41 prisoners subject to interdepartmental risk management, of whom five were at a level requiring regular review under multi agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA). An interdepartmental risk management meeting met twice a month to review prisoners of interest. Restrictions placed on high risk prisoners were appropriate and complemented by a comprehensive action plan to address and test risk factors with a view to relaxing restrictions safely.
- 4.27 Child safeguarding meetings were held as required when there were concerns about a prisoner's contact with his family.

Good practice

- 4.28 *Prisoners were encouraged to contribute their experiences and their views to categorisation boards through their entries in the green files and these were taken into account in decision making.*

Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners

- 4.29 At the time of the inspection, there were 60 indeterminate-sentenced prisoners of whom 33 were serving life sentences and 27 indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPP).
- 4.30 All offender supervisors with responsibility for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners had received appropriate training. Two probation officers were responsible for all IPP prisoners and high risk life-sentenced prisoners. Medium and low risk life-sentenced prisoners had dedicated lifer prison officer offender supervisors.
- 4.31 Indeterminate-sentenced were able to participate in accompanied temporary release, unaccompanied day release and home leave, subject to risk assessment. Some life-sentenced prisoners complained to us that they waited too long after arrival to have access to temporary release under open conditions, which had been directed by the Parole Board. We considered that the assessment process was reasonable in the light of the risks managed by the prison.
- 4.32 Accompanied temporary release was managed by individual offender supervisors and focused on assessing the prisoner's response to spending time in the community after a long period of imprisonment. Probation officers accompanying IPP prisoners made good use of the occasion as an opportunity to hold a joint meeting with the prisoner and his offender manager in his home area.
- 4.33 Quarterly consultation evening meetings with indeterminate-sentenced prisoners were well attended and used effectively to provide information and answer concerns raised. There were plans for a family day for indeterminate sentenced prisoners, but the opportunity of fully

exploiting the event to inform prisoners and their families about aspects of the indeterminate sentence system had not been fully considered.

- 4.34 In the previous six months, there had been 19 oral hearings and 16 had resulted in the prisoner's release. No parole dossiers were overdue.

Recommendation

- 4.35 **Events for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners and their families should inform them about the process of preparation for release, and the operation of post-custody supervision and leave conditions.**

Good practice

- 4.36 *Accompanied temporary release of prisoners serving indeterminate sentence for public protection included a meeting with their offender manager.*

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners' resettlement needs are met before release. An effective multiagency response is used to meet the specific needs of each individual prisoner to maximise the likelihood of successful reintegration into the community.

- 4.37 New arrivals were asked about their resettlement needs and informed who to contact for help, although our survey indicated insufficient awareness of how to access some services. Prisoners were rarely released without a settled address. Men were prepared well for employment, training and education on release. There were effective links with a range of training providers and employers and 70% left with employment to go to. All prisoners were offered a pre-release health check and health promotion materials. Prisoners with drug and/or alcohol problems were actively encouraged to engage with local community initiatives. Prisoners received good support to maintain contact with their families, particularly through the use of release on temporary licence. Appropriate interventions to deal with outstanding offending behaviour needs were provided mainly in the community.

- 4.38 In our survey, responses about knowing who to contact in the prison for help with reintegration services, such as accommodation and finance, benefit and debt issues, were similar to the comparator with open prisons, but we would have expected them to be much higher in a prison with a designated resettlement function. Responses were much worse than at the time of the last inspection. New arrivals were asked during induction if they had resettlement problems and were informed of the relevant support services available, but few required them. At the time of the inspection and when the survey was conducted, two important reintegration resources dealing with accommodation and finance and debt advice had been withdrawn and services were in a period of change. It was possible that the survey results reflected this change but there was a need to ensure the new services were appropriately publicised.

- 4.39 There was no formal discharge board but as part of the pre-release process prisoners completed a sign off with prison departments that checked some outstanding needs. This did

not include a specific check about accommodation but most housing issues had been dealt with as part of the assessment process and consideration for release on temporary licence. Many had specific accommodation identified as part of their licence conditions. Each prisoner had an interview with the governor before release.

- 4.40 We contacted offender managers for a number of prisoners released the previous month and found that so far they had all resettled successfully and had accommodation. Many had clearly directly benefited from the training and support they had received in the prison.

Recommendation

- 4.41 Prisoners should be fully aware of how to access resettlement services in the prison.

Accommodation

- 4.42 A specialist accommodation service previously provided by Nacro had recently ended and a probation service officer dealt with housing issues. While not specifically trained in housing he had relevant experience and had useful contacts with local voluntary accommodation services. His main role had been to help prisoners make applications for accommodation to local authorities. He could also make referrals to hostel accommodation and to the bail accommodation and support services (BASS) project for prisoners applying for home detention curfew. The service was not monitored to ensure that prisoners' needs were adequately met although outcomes appeared good.
- 4.43 In our survey, only 15% of respondents, against the comparator of 23%, thought they would have problems finding accommodation on release. The prison recorded a key performance figure of more than 99% of prisoners released to settled accommodation during the year to date. However, there was no evidence that the suitability of the address for permanent accommodation was checked. Exit interview data showed that in the previous three months all the 39 prisoners released had accommodation. Of these, 37 were going to live with their partner or family. We checked the outcomes for a sample of prisoners released in the previous month and found that they had all sustained their release accommodation.

Recommendation

- 4.44 Accommodation services should keep records of prisoner contact and monitor outcomes to ensure that prisoners obtain suitable and sustainable accommodation for release.

Housekeeping point

- 4.45 The suitability of prisoners' permanent accommodation on release should be checked.

Employment, training and education

- 4.46 Employment, training and education were central to the prison's resettlement function. Prisoners started preparation for release at an early stage. CIAS effectively focused on preparing prisoners for employment on release and learning and skills targets were incorporated into sentence plans.

- 4.47 Staff had a clear understanding of the employment opportunities in prisoners' release areas. Prisoners were effectively helped to develop skills to support sustained employment on release and ROTL was used extensively to help gain experience. Prisoners were prepared well for placements in the community through an individually tailored pre-placement course. All prisoners had good access to support in developing their CV, application and interview skills. Job search facilities were readily available.
- 4.48 Good links with a variety of training providers enabled prisoners to access training before and following release. The prison had also developed excellent contacts with a range of employers to improve opportunities for employment. An impressive 70% of prisoners left with employment to go to.

Mental and physical health

- 4.49 All men were offered pre-release health checks. Those in treatment were given take-home medication and summaries of care for their GPs. Prisoners were given a pack containing health promotion materials, condoms and information on where to find essential health care facilities in their areas.
- 4.50 There was an end-of-life pathway, palliative care protocol and care programme approach, none of which had been needed in the previous year.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.51 CARAT clients had good quality care plans and with the prisoner's agreement these were shared with health and offender management services. There was good joint working and cross-referrals between departments. Feedback was obtained through exit surveys.
- 4.52 In our survey, 100% of respondents knew who to speak to for help with contacting external drug and alcohol agencies. CARAT staff actively promoted community engagement and men could attend Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous meetings in the locality and valued the experience.
- 4.53 Seven CARAT clients were currently training to become peer supporters and undertaking a level 2 National Open College Network (NOCN)-accredited module in peer mentoring and drug and alcohol information, facilitated by the crime reduction initiative (CRI). Two trainees were working at the CRI's local community drug and alcohol project, and many of the peer supporters hoped to become volunteer workers on release. This was an inspiring initiative. Prisoners believed that an internal peer support scheme would also be useful.
- 4.54 Release plans were of good quality and all prisoners received regular CARAT input before release. There were strong links with the local drug intervention programme (DIP) providers and joint meetings were held with the client before his release. However, many CARAT clients declined the offer of DIP contact as they did not feel they needed further ongoing support.

Recommendation

- 4.55 The counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service should further encourage and improve service user involvement and consultation, and develop an internal peer support scheme for prisoners with drug and/or alcohol problems.

Good practice

- 4.56 *Prisoners could undertake accredited training to become community drug and alcohol peer mentors, which provided opportunities for useful work after release.*

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.57 The finance, benefit and debt advice services, previously delivered by Citizens Advice (CAB), had ended earlier in 2011, and a community-based organisation, Five Lamps, was due to start the week after the inspection. In the meantime, advice and support for prisoners with financial problems had been limited to the services of a probation service officer with no specialist training, and telephone contact with CAB workers at a nearby prison. As well as individual advice, the proposed service included financial workshops and had the potential to provide community placements for prisoners.
- 4.58 Prisoners were assisted with opening bank accounts with a local branch of the HSBC.
- 4.59 Before discharge, prisoners could obtain advice on claiming benefits from the probation service officer and from the job club, which also set up appointments for opening benefits claims.

Recommendation

- 4.60 **The new finance and advice service should ensure that prisoners have the opportunity to gain the knowledge and skills required to manage their finances adequately in prison and on release.**

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.61 The chaplaincy led on the children and families pathway and all new arrivals were seen in private by a chaplain who recorded if they had children, checked contact issues and if there were any family matters they needed help with. Members of the chaplaincy often spoke to prisoners' families on the telephone. The coordinating chaplain, who had just left and not yet been replaced, had carried out the role of family support worker. She had been available in the visits rooms on Sundays to talk to visitors, liaised with family and social services, provided written applications of support at family court hearings, and had accompanied a prisoner to his children's case conference. This work was currently being covered by another chaplain.
- 4.62 Prisoners wrote about contact with their family in their files but there was little comment from personal officers to show that they were aware of the family dynamics of prisoners (see section on staff-prisoner relationships).
- 4.63 Inter-prison telephone calls and inter-prison visits were facilitated, and additional visits were organised through the chaplaincy. When necessary, the chaplaincy facilitated calls from children or to deal with arrangements for them.
- 4.64 Library staff organised five family craft sessions a year during school holidays, which involved prisoners, their partners and children in a variety of craft activities. An annual Christmas party was held for the children of prisoners unable to have release on temporary licence (ROTL)

during this period. Prisoners could request a Christmas gift for their child via the Prison Fellowship Angel Tree, a charity that raises money for this purpose.

- 4.65 ROTL was used very effectively to help prisoners maintain and re-establish relationships with their families. Suitable prisoners were able to meet family and friends in the community on weekend town visits. Prisoners could go home on town visits, usually up to a 100-mile radius of the establishment, but prisoners living further away could apply for permission to extend the time to enable longer journeys. ROTL was also very well used to allow prisoners to have overnight home leave after their initial 28 days of town visits, and to help them maintain family contact in a variety of ways such as attending ante-natal appointments with their partners.
- 4.66 In December 2010, Barnardo's had delivered an accredited 12-week 'parent factor' programme to fathers with a history of substance misuse, focusing on the effects of drug use on children's family life. Stockton Borough Council had funded the course and had funded the training of a CARATs worker to deliver a second course during 2011.
- 4.67 Prisoners not yet entitled to ROTL could have weekly two-hour visits, which ran on Wednesday, Friday and weekend afternoons from 1.45pm to 3.45pm. Prisoners booked visits themselves through staff in the information room.
- 4.68 There was no visitors' centre and visitors waited outside the main gate. There was a small shelter, which visitors told us was quickly filled when it rained. Officers did not start allowing visitors to enter the prison until 1.45pm and some visitors complained of losing time off their visit. A variety of information was displayed for visitors advertising local and national support and information groups. There was no comments book, for visitors to leave feedback about their visits experience.
- 4.69 The visits room was clean and bright, accommodating up to 20 groups of visitors, and visits staff were polite and welcoming. Furniture was comfortable and prisoners could sit alongside their visitors, but on a fixed identified seat, which seemed anomalous as prisoners could play with their children in the well-stocked play area, and also sit with visitors on fixed picnic tables and benches in the adjacent open-air play area during summer months. There was a tea bar managed by volunteers from NEPACS (North East Prison After Care Society), and a prisoner orderly sold a variety of refreshments.

Recommendation

- 4.70 **Visitors should be allowed into the prison in time for visits to begin at the published time and better shelter should be provided for those waiting to do so.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.71 The need for interventions was low as most prisoners had completed programmes at previous establishments.
- 4.72 The prison had a service level agreement with Durham and Tees Valley Probation Trust to provide places on offending behaviour programmes in the community. In the previous 12 months, 26 prisoners had completed accredited programmes. At the time of the inspection there was a manageable waiting list of 12 for thinking skills, domestic abuse and violence reduction programmes – which were a sentence planning target for 10 of them.

4.73 A psychologist provided individual sessions and assessments for prisoners, usually at the direction of the Parole Board. She also provided individual relapse prevention sessions to continue the cognitive self-change programme completed in other establishments by prisoners with convictions for violence.

Section 5: Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice

The following is a listing of recommendations and examples of good practice included in this report. The reference numbers at the end of each refer to the paragraph location in the main report.

Recommendations	To the governor
Security and rules	
5.1	Decisions to return prisoners to closed conditions should be fully evidenced in records. (1.33)
Discipline	
5.2	All disciplinary charges should be fully investigated with clear reasons given for the decisions reached. (1.41)
Residential units	
5.3	Ongoing problems with the water pressure, shower temperature and the toilets on K wing should be rectified. (2.9)
Staff-prisoner relationships	
5.4	Personal officers should make regular entries in prisoners' files commenting on progress in meeting resettlement objectives, family issues and other relevant matters. (2.15)
Diversity	
5.5	The prison should take action, in consultation with regional staff and the UK Border Agency, to encourage applications from foreign national prisoners likely to be released in the UK. (2.35)
5.6	Muslim prisoners and staff should be consulted to identify and address reasons for Muslim prisoners' poor perception of their treatment by staff. (2.36)
Complaints	
5.7	Managers should ensure that prisoners are confident that using the complaint system will not result in repercussions. (2.53)
Health services	
5.8	Policies and procedures, which should include an information sharing protocol, should be relevant, within review date, pertinent to the local health and social care environment, and with local contact details as appropriate. (2.71)

- 5.9 Triage algorithms should be used to assist nurses to make informed clinical decisions. (2.81)
- 5.10 The pharmacist should visit the prison periodically to check systems and provide clinical audit and medication reviews. (2.87)

Catering

- 5.11 Prisoners should have additional facilities to cook for themselves. (2.103)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.12 The prison should further develop the use of learning and skills data to evaluate fully the impact of initiatives. (3.6)
- 5.13 The prison should work with employers to improve their involvement in target setting. (3.22)
- 5.14 Prisoners attending external courses should receive timely access to computers needed for course work. (3.23)
- 5.15 The prison should fully implement and monitor the strategy for improving pass rates in numeracy at level 2. (3.26)
- 5.16 Prisoners and library staff should have appropriate access to the internet. (3.28)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.17 Prisoners should have access to PE facilities, including when regular PE staff are absent. (3.37)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.18 All resettlement pathways and services should be monitored to demonstrate the effectiveness of action taken by the prison in helping successful resettlement outcomes. (4.6)

Offender management and planning

- 5.19 Offender assessment system (OASys) assessment reviews should be completed on all prisoners within eight weeks of their arrival. (4.21)
- 5.20 Events for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners and their families should inform them about the process of preparation for release, and the operation of post-custody supervision and leave conditions. (4.35)

Reintegration planning

- 5.21 Prisoners should be fully aware of how to access resettlement services in the prison. (4.41)
- 5.22 Accommodation services should keep records of prisoner contact and monitor outcomes to ensure that prisoners obtain suitable and sustainable accommodation for release. (4.44)

- 5.23 The counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service should further encourage and improve service user involvement and consultation, and develop an internal peer support scheme for prisoners with drug and/or alcohol problems. (4.55)
- 5.24 The new finance and advice service should ensure that prisoners have the opportunity to gain the knowledge and skills required to manage their finances adequately in prison and on release. (4.60)
- 5.25 Visitors should be allowed into the prison in time for visits to begin at the published time and better shelter should be provided for those waiting to do so. (4.70)

Housekeeping points

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.26 Prisoners applying for a place at Kirklevington Grange should be fully informed of the regimes, services and timescales they will be subject to in advance of their arrival. (1.4)

Security and rules

- 5.27 All security measures should be proportionate and reflect the security status of prisoners at Kirklevington. (1.34)

Discipline

- 5.28 There should be a quality assurance system for adjudications. (1.42)
- 5.29 Toilets in cells in the segregation unit should be appropriately screened. (1.46)
- 5.30 Documentation authorising segregation should be fully completed and justify the reasons for segregation. (1.47)

Substance misuse

- 5.31 The counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) officer should not wear the same uniform as discipline staff. (1.56)

Diversity

- 5.32 The NOMS short-term monitoring tool should be used to trace patterns and trends in equality areas outside the scope of the SMART tool. (2.37)
- 5.33 All lists and photographs of staff and prisoners with diversity roles should be kept up to date. (2.38)
- 5.34 A programme of prisoner education should address the boundaries between expression of acceptable political views and unacceptable extremism. (2.39)

Complaints

- 5.35 Quality assurance of complaints should ensure that prisoners receive helpful and appropriate replies. (2.54)

Legal rights

- 5.36 The legal services officer should receive up-to-date training. (2.59)

Health services

- 5.37 The care planning and template functions of SystemOne should be used more widely for prisoners with lifelong conditions. (2.82)
- 5.38 Further patient group directions should be developed to enable nurses to supply more potent medication and avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. (2.88)
- 5.39 All medicines should be stored at appropriate temperatures with maximum/minimum temperatures recorded daily for the drug refrigerators to ensure that heat-sensitive items are stored within the 2- 8°C range. (2.89)

Shop

- 5.40 Shop provision should be an agreed item at the consultation meetings with black and minority ethnic prisoners. (2.108)
- 5.41 Decisions made at shop consultative meetings should be recorded. (2.109)

Offender management and planning

- 5.42 Offender supervisors should be provided with supervision and feedback on the quality of their work. (4.22)

Reintegration planning

- 5.43 The suitability of prisoners' permanent accommodation on release should be checked. (4.45)

Examples of good practice

- 5.44 Prisoners with drugs and/or alcohol problems could access a wide range of interventions, many of which were co-delivered with community service providers, and there was positive service user feedback on the help they received. (1.57)
- 5.45 Diversity strand leads continued to offer individual and group support for minority groups, even though there had been little or no take up to date. (2.40)

- 5.46 The well-established work supporting ex-forces men had given real help to many and had built strong partnerships with external organisations able to assist, especially with accommodation and other resettlement issues. (2.41)
- 5.47 Attention to detail in infection control compliance and to regular cleaning provided prisoners with a very low risk of health centre acquired infections. (2.72)
- 5.48 The training of prisoners in the use of automated external defibrillators provided collateral support for staff and enabled prisoners to acquire useful skills. (2.73)
- 5.49 The independent audit of resuscitation equipment and preparedness helped the men focus on a high risk area and provided a clear rationale for developments and improvements. (2.74)
- 5.50 The relevance, availability and extent of support and therapy options for prisoners with common mental health problems was impressive and ensured they had access to appropriate care to help manage their conditions. (2.96)
- 5.51 Prisoners due for discharge had an interview with the governor to give their views on their experience of the prison, which were used to inform the development of services. (4.7)
- 5.52 Family members attended some sentence planning boards, which helped include them in the work the prisoner needed to do to reduce their risk of reoffending. (4.23)
- 5.53 Prisoners were encouraged to contribute their experiences and their views to categorisation boards through their entries in the green files and these were taken into account in decision making. (4.28)
- 5.54 Accompanied temporary release of prisoners serving indeterminate sentence for public protection included a meeting with their offender manager. (4.36)
- 5.55 Prisoners could undertake accredited training to become community drug and alcohol peer mentors, which provided opportunities for useful work after release. (4.56)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief Inspector
Michael Loughlin	Team leader
Joss Crosbie	Inspector
Paul Fenning	Inspector
Martin Kettle	Inspector
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Kellie Reeve	Inspector
Laura Nettleingham	Senior researcher
Adam Altoft	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Sigrid Engelen	Drugs inspector
Paul Tarbuck	Health services inspector
Helen Jackson	Pharmacy inspector
Nigel Bragg	Ofsted inspector
Steven Miller	Ofsted inspector
Margaret Hobson	Ofsted inspector
Steve Woodgate	HMI Probation
Martyn Griffiths	HMI Probation

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Status	21 and over	%
Sentenced	278	100
Total	278	100

Sentence	21 and over	%
2 years to less than 4 years	25	9
4 years to less than 10 years	174	62.6
10 years and over (not life)	19	6.8
ISPP	27	9.8
Life	33	11.8
Total	278	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
21 years to 29 years	90	32.3
30 years to 39 years	107	38.5
40 years to 49 years	54	19.4
50 years to 59 years	20	7.1
60 years to 69 years	6	2.1
70 plus years	1	0.6
Total	278	100

Nationality	21 and over	%
British	278	100
Foreign nationals	-	-
Total	278	100

Security category	21 and over	%
Cat C	47	16.9
Cat D	231	83.1
Total	278	100

Ethnicity	21 and over	%
White:		
British	223	80.2
Other white	2	0.7
Mixed:		
White and black Caribbean	3	1.1
White and Asian	2	0.7
Asian or Asian British:		
Indian	6	2.2
Pakistani	16	5.7
Bangladeshi	1	0.4
Other Asian	8	2.9
Black or black British:		
Caribbean	4	1.4

Other black	5	1.8
Not stated	8	2.9
Total	278	100

Religion	21 and over	%
Church of England	92	33.1
Roman Catholic	38	13.7
Other Christian denominations	7	2.4
Muslim	35	12.6
Sikh	2	0.7
Hindu	1	0.4
Buddhist	8	2.9
Jewish	1	0.4
Other	2	0.7
No religion	92	33.1
Total	278	100

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	21 and over	
	Number	%
6 months to 1 year	39	14
1 year to 2 years	160	57.6
2 years to 4 years	18	6.5
4 years or more	61	21.9
Total	278	100

Main offence	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	81	29.1
Burglary	15	5.4
Robbery	31	11.2
Theft and handling	4	1.4
Fraud and forgery	13	4.6
Drugs offences	103	37.1
Other offences	31	11.2
Total	278	100

Appendix III: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Choosing the sample size

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

At the time of the survey on 11 April 2011, the prisoner population at HMP Kirklevington Grange was 264. The sample size was 148. Overall, this represented 56% of the prisoner population.

Selecting the sample

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

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

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

Methodology

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

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

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

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

Response rates

In total, 131 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 50% of the prison population. The response rate was 89%. In addition to the four respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, nine questionnaires were not returned and four were returned blank.

Comparisons

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

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

The following analyses have been conducted:

- The current survey responses in 2011 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in open prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 13 open prisons since November 2006.
- The current survey responses in 2011 against the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Kirklevington in 2005.
- A comparison within the 2011 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2011 survey between the responses of Muslim and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2011 survey between the responses of prisoners aged 50 and over and those under 50.

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

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

Summary

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

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

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

Survey results

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?	
	<i>Under 21</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	43 (33%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	51 (39%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	22 (17%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	11 (8%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	1 (1%)
Q1.3	Are you on recall?	
	<i>Yes</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>No</i>	123 (98%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?	
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	15 (11%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	75 (57%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	10 (8%)
	<i>IPP (Indeterminate Sentence for Public Protection)</i>	16 (12%)
	<i>Life</i>	14 (11%)
Q1.5	Approximately, how long do you have left to serve? (If you are serving life or IPP, please use the date of your next board.)	
	<i>6 months or less</i>	54 (45%)
	<i>More than 6 months</i>	66 (55%)
Q1.6	How long have you been in this prison?	
	<i>Less than 1 month</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>1 to less than 3 months</i>	18 (14%)
	<i>3 to less than 6 months</i>	17 (13%)
	<i>6 to less than 12 months</i>	33 (25%)
	<i>12 months to less than 2 years</i>	30 (23%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 years</i>	15 (12%)
	<i>4 years or more</i>	14 (11%)
Q1.7	Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not hold UK citizenship)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>No</i>	129 (98%)
Q1.8	Is English your first language?	
	<i>Yes</i>	125 (98%)
	<i>No</i>	3 (2%)

Q1.9 What is your ethnic origin?

<i>White - British</i>	106 (81%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	0 (0%)
<i>White - Irish</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other..</i>	0 (0%)
<i>White - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed heritage - white and black Caribbean</i>	5 (4%)
<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	4 (3%)	<i>Mixed heritage - white and black African</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Black or black British - African</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed heritage - white and Asian</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Black or black British - other ...</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed heritage - other</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Chinese</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	13 (10%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	0 (0%)

Q1.10 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?

<i>Yes</i>	5 (4%)
<i>No</i>	125 (96%)

Q1.11 What is your religion?

<i>None</i>	43 (33%)	<i>Hindu</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Church of England</i>	32 (25%)	<i>Jewish</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Catholic</i>	29 (22%)	<i>Muslim</i>	16 (12%)
<i>Protestant</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Sikh</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Other</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	3 (2%)		

Q1.12 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

<i>Heterosexual/straight</i>	128 (98%)
<i>Homosexual/gay</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Other</i>	1 (1%)

Q1.13 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

<i>Yes</i>	9 (7%)
<i>No</i>	122 (93%)

Q1.14 How many times have you been in prison before?

<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2 to 5</i>	<i>More than 5</i>
64 (50%)	16 (12%)	39 (30%)	10 (8%)

Q1.15 Including this prison, how many prisons have you been in during this sentence/remand time?

<i>1</i>	<i>2 to 5</i>	<i>More than 5</i>
1 (1%)	105 (81%)	23 (18%)

Q1.16 Do you have any children under the age of 18?

<i>Yes</i>	69 (53%)
<i>No</i>	61 (47%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1 We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between prisons. How was:

	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>	<i>N/A</i>
The cleanliness of the van?	8 (6%)	50 (38%)	27 (21%)	26 (20%)	15 (11%)	4 (3%)	1 (1%)
Your personal safety during the journey?	12 (9%)	67 (52%)	20 (16%)	18 (14%)	8 (6%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)
The comfort of the van?	5 (4%)	14 (11%)	13 (10%)	50 (38%)	48 (37%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
The attention paid to your health needs?	7 (5%)	36 (28%)	33 (26%)	21 (16%)	14 (11%)	6 (5%)	11 (9%)
The frequency of toilet breaks?	4 (3%)	12 (9%)	26 (20%)	25 (19%)	39 (30%)	2 (2%)	23 (18%)

Q2.2 How long did you spend in the van?

	<i>Less than 1 hour</i>	<i>Over 1 hour to 2 hours</i>	<i>Over 2 hours to 4 hours</i>	<i>More than 4 hours</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>
	27 (21%)	55 (42%)	41 (32%)	6 (5%)	1 (1%)

Q2.3 How did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?

	<i>Very well</i>	<i>Well</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Badly</i>	<i>Very badly</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>
	18 (14%)	66 (51%)	32 (25%)	8 (6%)	4 (3%)	2 (2%)

Q2.4 Please answer the following questions about when you first arrived here:

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>
Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	124 (96%)	4 (3%)	1 (1%)
Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	35 (27%)	94 (73%)	0 (0%)
When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	123 (96%)	5 (4%)	0 (0%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1 In the first 24 hours, did staff ask you if you needed help or support with the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Didn't ask about any of these.....</i>	20 (17%)	<i>Money worries.....</i>	13 (11%)
<i>Loss of property.....</i>	15 (13%)	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal.....</i>	57 (48%)
<i>Housing problems.....</i>	16 (13%)	<i>Health problems.....</i>	69 (58%)
<i>Contacting employers.....</i>	9 (8%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners.....</i>	11 (9%)
<i>Contacting family.....</i>	64 (54%)	<i>Accessing phone numbers.....</i>	50 (42%)
<i>Ensuring dependants were being looked after.....</i>	8 (7%)	<i>Other.....</i>	5 (4%)

Q3.2 Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Didn't have any problems	65 (64%)	Money worries	8 (8%)
<i>Loss of property</i>	5 (5%)	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Housing problems</i>	4 (4%)	<i>Health problems</i>	7 (7%)
<i>Contacting employers</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Contacting family</i>	8 (8%)	<i>Accessing phone numbers</i>	8 (8%)
<i>Ensuring dependants were looked after</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Other</i>	3 (3%)

Q3.3 Please answer the following questions about reception:

	Yes	No	Don't remember
Were you seen by a member of health services?	98 (76%)	24 (19%)	7 (5%)
When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	117 (94%)	3 (2%)	5 (4%)

Q3.4 Overall, how well did you feel you were treated in reception?

<i>Very well</i>	<i>Well</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Badly</i>	<i>Very badly</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>
43 (34%)	64 (50%)	16 (13%)	4 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Q3.5 On your day of arrival, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Information about what was going to happen to you</i>	93 (73%)
<i>Information about what support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	67 (53%)
<i>Information about how to make routine requests</i>	93 (73%)
<i>Information about your entitlement to visits</i>	95 (75%)
<i>Information about health services</i>	92 (72%)
<i>Information about the chaplaincy</i>	81 (64%)
Not offered anything	16 (13%)

Q3.6 On your day of arrival, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>A smokers/non-smokers pack</i>	109 (84%)
<i>The opportunity to have a shower</i>	100 (78%)
<i>The opportunity to make a free telephone call</i>	85 (66%)
<i>Something to eat</i>	101 (78%)
Did not receive anything	6 (5%)

Q3.7 Did you meet any of the following people within the first 24 hours of your arrival at this prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Chaplain or religious leader</i>	56 (44%)
<i>Someone from health services</i>	106 (83%)
<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>	12 (9%)
Did not meet any of these people	16 (13%)

Q3.8	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours of your arrival at this prison?	
	Yes	13 (10%)
	No	115 (90%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes	126 (98%)
	No	3 (2%)
	Don't remember.....	0 (0%)
Q3.10	How soon after your arrival did you go on an induction course?	
	Have not been on an induction course	2 (2%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	119 (94%)
	<i>More than a week after my arrival</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (3%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	Have not been on an induction course	2 (2%)
	Yes	104 (81%)
	No	17 (13%)
	Don't remember.....	6 (5%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to:					
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
						<i>N/A</i>
	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	40 (31%)	60 (47%)	9 (7%)	6 (5%)	1 (1%)
	Attend legal visits?	34 (28%)	49 (40%)	6 (5%)	3 (2%)	1 (1%)
						30 (24%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?					
	Not had any letters					29 (23%)
	Yes					28 (22%)
	No					70 (55%)
Q4.3	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:					
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>N/A</i>	
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	126 (98%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	56 (45%)	25 (20%)	1 (1%)	43 (34%)	
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	81 (63%)	40 (31%)	1 (1%)	7 (5%)	

Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	102 (80%)	25 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	84 (66%)	11 (9%)	16 (13%)	16 (13%)

Q4.4 What is the food like here?

<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
44 (34%)	58 (45%)	14 (11%)	8 (6%)	5 (4%)

Q4.5 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?

<i>Have not bought anything yet</i>	1 (1%)
Yes.....	82 (64%)
No.....	46 (36%)

Q4.6 Is it easy or difficult to get:

	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
A complaint form?	63 (48%)	50 (38%)	5 (4%)	4 (3%)	1 (1%)	7 (5%)
An application form?	77 (62%)	45 (36%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)

Q4.7 Have you made an application?

Yes.....	119 (92%)
No.....	10 (8%)

Q4.8 Please answer the following questions concerning applications:

(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)

	Not made one	Yes	No
Do you feel <i>applications</i> are dealt with fairly?	10 (8%)	97 (80%)	15 (12%)
Do you feel <i>applications</i> are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	10 (8%)	94 (76%)	19 (15%)

Q4.9 Have you made a complaint?

Yes.....	15 (12%)
No.....	114 (88%)

Q4.10 Please answer the following questions concerning complaints:

(If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)

	Not made one	Yes	No
Do you feel <i>complaints</i> are dealt with fairly?	114 (88%)	6 (5%)	9 (7%)
Do you feel <i>complaints</i> are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	114 (90%)	5 (4%)	7 (6%)
Were you given information about how to make an appeal?	75 (67%)	16 (14%)	21 (19%)

Q4.11	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?				
	<i>Not made a complaint</i>	114	(90%)		
	Yes	2	(2%)		
	No	11	(9%)		
Q4.12	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?				
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>
	25 (20%)	24 (19%)	41 (33%)	25 (20%)	9 (7%)
					2 (2%)
Q4.13	Please answer the following questions about your religious beliefs?				
		Yes	No	<i>Don't know/N/A</i>	
	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	69 (55%)	9 (7%)	48 (38%)	
	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	81 (65%)	1 (1%)	43 (34%)	
Q4.14	Can you speak to a listener at any time, if you want to?				
	Yes	No	<i>Don't know</i>		
	105 (82%)	1 (1%)	22 (17%)		
Q4.15	Please answer the following questions about staff in this prison?				
		Yes	No		
	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	111 (87%)	17 (13%)		
	Do most staff treat you with respect?	112 (88%)	15 (12%)		

Section 5: Safety

Q5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?		
	Yes	8	(6%)
	No	122	(94%)
Q5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?		
	Yes	2	(2%)
	No	128	(98%)
Q5.3	In which areas of this prison do you/have you ever felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	122	(95%)
	<i>At mealtimes</i>	2	(2%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>At health services</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Visit's area</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>In wing showers</i>	2	(2%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>In gym showers</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>At work</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>In your cell</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>During movement</i>	2	(2%)
	<i>At religious services</i>	1	(1%)

At education..... 0 (0%)

Q5.4 Have you been victimised by another prisoner or group of prisoners here?

Yes 5 (4%)

No 125 (96%) **If No, go to question 5.6**

Q5.5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Because of your sexuality.....</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Because you have a disability...</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Sexual abuse.....</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Because of your religion/religious beliefs.....</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Because of your race or ethnic origin.....</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Because of your age.....</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Because of drugs.....</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Being from a different part of the country than others.....</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken.....</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Because of your offence/crime..</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Because you were new here.....</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Because of gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)

Q5.6 Have you been victimised by a member of staff or group of staff here?

Yes 16 (12%)

No 113 (88%) **If No, go to question 5.8**

Q5.7 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....</i>	8 (6%)	<i>Because you have a disability...</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Because of your religion/religious beliefs.....</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Sexual abuse.....</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Because of your age.....</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Because of your race or ethnic origin.....</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Being from a different part of the country than others.....</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Because of drugs.....</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Because of your offence/crime..</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Because you were new here.....</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Because of gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Because of your sexuality.....</i>	0 (0%)		

Q5.8 If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?

Not been victimised 110 (87%)

Yes 2 (2%)

No 15 (12%)

Q5.9 Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?

Yes 6 (5%)

No 124 (95%)

Q5.10 Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff/group of staff in here?

Yes 13 (10%)
 No 116 (90%)

Q5.11 Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?

<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
25 (19%)	13 (10%)	12 (9%)	4 (3%)	3 (2%)	72 (56%)

Section 6: Health services

Q6.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	4 (3%)	65 (50%)	60 (47%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
The nurse	1 (1%)	80 (63%)	47 (37%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
The dentist	8 (6%)	46 (36%)	55 (43%)	8 (6%)	10 (8%)	1 (1%)
The optician	30 (23%)	39 (30%)	44 (34%)	10 (8%)	5 (4%)	0 (0%)

Q6.2 Are you able to see a pharmacist?

Yes 58 (50%)
 No 59 (50%)

Q6.3 What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	5 (4%)	73 (57%)	46 (36%)	3 (2%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
The nurse	2 (2%)	90 (70%)	34 (27%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
The dentist	19 (15%)	62 (49%)	35 (28%)	5 (4%)	4 (3%)	1 (1%)
The optician	54 (43%)	33 (26%)	31 (24%)	7 (6%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)

Q6.4 What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?

<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
1 (1%)	85 (66%)	42 (33%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Q6.5 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes 56 (43%)
 No 73 (57%)

Q6.6 If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep possession of your medication in your own cell?

Not taking medication 73 (57%)
 Yes 56 (43%)
 No 0 (0%)

Q6.7 Do you feel you have any emotional well-being/mental health issues?

Yes 14 (11%)
 No 115 (89%)

Q6.8 Are your emotional well-being/mental health issues being addressed by any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Do not have any issues/not receiving any help 117
(92%)

Doctor 7 (6%)

Nurse..... 5 (4%)

Psychiatrist..... 0 (0%)

Mental health in-reach team..... 1 (1%)

Counsellor..... 1 (1%)

Other..... 3 (2%)

Q6.9 Did you have a problem with either of the following when you came into this prison?

	Yes	No
Drugs	10 (8%)	115 (92%)
Alcohol	8 (6%)	119 (94%)

Q6.10 Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?

Yes 1 (1%)

No..... 128 (99%)

Q6.11 Do you know who to contact in this prison to get help with your drug or alcohol problem?

Yes 14 (11%)

No..... 0 (0%)

Did not/do not have a drug or alcohol problem 114 (89%)

Q6.12 Have you received any intervention or help (including, CARATs, Health Services etc.) for your drug/alcohol problem, while in this prison?

Yes 13 (10%)

No..... 1 (1%)

Did not/do not have a drug or alcohol problem 114 (89%)

Q6.13 Was the intervention or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?

Yes 14 (11%)

No..... 0 (0%)

Did not have a problem/have not received help..... 115 (89%)

Q6.14 Do you think you will have a problem with either of the following when you leave this prison?

	Yes	No	<i>Don't know</i>
Drugs	1 (1%)	122 (95%)	6 (5%)
Alcohol	2 (2%)	120 (94%)	6 (5%)

Q6.15 Do you know who in this prison can help you contact external drug or alcohol agencies on release?

Yes 8 (6%)

No.....	0 (0%)
N/A.....	118 (94%)

Section 7: Purposeful activity

Q7.1 Are you currently involved in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Prison job	97 (75%)
Vocational or skills training.....	45 (35%)
Education (including basic skills).....	50 (38%)
Offending behaviour programmes.....	12 (9%)
Not involved in any of these	18 (14%)

Q7.2 If you have been involved in any of the following, whilst in this prison, do you think it will help you on release?

	Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
Prison job	2 (2%)	69 (59%)	42 (36%)	3 (3%)
Vocational or skills training	10 (10%)	74 (74%)	8 (8%)	8 (8%)
Education (including basic skills)	5 (5%)	78 (75%)	15 (14%)	6 (6%)
Offending behaviour programmes	14 (18%)	35 (44%)	23 (29%)	7 (9%)

Q7.3 How often do you go to the library?

Don't want to go	8 (6%)
<i>Never</i>	12 (9%)
<i>Less than once a week</i>	38 (29%)
<i>About once a week</i>	39 (30%)
<i>More than once a week</i>	26 (20%)
<i>Don't know</i>	7 (5%)

Q7.4 On average how many times do you go to the gym each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	0	1	2	3 to 5	More than 5	Don't know
20 (15%)	12 (9%)	0 (0%)	9 (7%)	45 (35%)	42 (32%)	2 (2%)

Q7.5 On average how many times do you go outside for exercise each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	0	1 to 2	3 to 5	More than 5	Don't know
3 (2%)	9 (7%)	9 (7%)	27 (21%)	72 (56%)	8 (6%)

Q7.6 On average how many hours do you spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	1 (1%)
<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	1 (1%)
<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	5 (4%)
<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	7 (5%)
<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	22 (17%)
<i>10 hours or more</i>	85 (65%)
<i>Don't know</i>	9 (7%)

Q7.7 On average, how many times do you have association each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	0	1 to 2	3 to 5	More than 5	<i>Don't know</i>
6 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	102 (84%)	11 (9%)

Q7.8 How often do staff normally speak to you during association time?

<i>Do not go on association</i>	9 (7%)
<i>Never</i>	10 (8%)
<i>Rarely</i>	18 (14%)
<i>Some of the time</i>	43 (34%)
<i>Most of the time</i>	23 (18%)
<i>All of the time</i>	22 (18%)

Section 8: Resettlement

Q8.1 When did you first meet your personal officer?

<i>Still have not met him/her</i>	3 (2%)
<i>In the first week</i>	83 (64%)
<i>More than a week</i>	33 (25%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	11 (8%)

Q8.2 How helpful do you think your personal officer is?

<i>Do not have a personal officer/ still have not met him/her</i>	<i>Very helpful</i>	<i>Helpful</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Not very helpful</i>	<i>Not at all helpful</i>
3 (2%)	53 (41%)	47 (36%)	13 (10%)	11 (8%)	3 (2%)

Q8.3 Do you have a sentence plan/OASys?

<i>Yes</i>	108 (84%)
<i>No</i>	21 (16%)

Q8.4 How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?

<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i>	21 (16%)
<i>Very involved</i>	45 (35%)
<i>Involved</i>	49 (38%)
<i>Neither</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Not very involved</i>	11 (9%)
<i>Not at all involved</i>	3 (2%)

Q8.5 Can you achieve all or some of your sentence plan targets in this prison?

<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i>	21 (17%)
<i>Yes</i>	95 (75%)
<i>No</i>	11 (9%)

Q8.6 Are there plans for you to achieve all/some of your sentence plan targets in another prison?

<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i>	21 (16%)
<i>Yes</i>	28 (22%)
<i>No</i>	80 (62%)

- Q8.7 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to address your offending behaviour while at this prison?**
 Yes 68 (54%)
 No 59 (46%)
- Q8.8 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?**
 Yes 69 (54%)
 No 59 (46%)
- Q8.9 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?**
 Yes 16 (12%)
 No 107 (82%)
 Don't know..... 7 (5%)
- Q8.10 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?**
 Yes 20 (15%)
 No 109 (84%)
 Don't know..... 1 (1%)
- Q8.11 Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?**
Not been here a week yet 2 (2%)
 Yes 88 (68%)
 No 34 (26%)
 Don't remember..... 6 (5%)
- Q8.12 How many visits did you receive in the last week?**

Not been in a week	0	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 or more
2 (2%)	58 (50%)	55 (47%)	0 (0%)	2 (2%)
- Q8.13 How are you and your family/friends treated by visits staff?**
Not had any visits 9 (7%)
 Very well 59 (47%)
 Well 42 (33%)
 Neither 7 (6%)
 Badly 1 (1%)
 Very badly 1 (1%)
 Don't know..... 7 (6%)
- Q8.14 Have you been helped to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?**
 Yes 100 (79%)
 No 26 (21%)
- Q8.15 Do you know who to contact to get help with the following within this prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

Don't know who to contact .. 21 (18%)	Help with your finances in preparation for release .. 40 (35%)
Maintaining good relationships 38 (33%)	Claiming benefits on release .. 44 (39%)

<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	25 (22%)	<i>Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release.....</i>	57 (50%)
<i>Finding a job on release</i>	74 (65%)	<i>Continuity of health services on release.....</i>	38 (33%)
<i>Finding accommodation on release.....</i>	49 (43%)	<i>Opening a bank account.....</i>	49 (43%)

Q8.16 Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following on release from prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

No problems.....	61 (53%)	<i>Help with your finances in preparation for release</i>	15 (13%)
<i>Maintaining good relationships.....</i>	4 (3%)	<i>Claiming benefits on release..</i>	13 (11%)
<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release.....</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Finding a job on release</i>	38 (33%)	<i>Continuity of health services on release.....</i>	7 (6%)
<i>Finding accommodation on release.....</i>	17 (15%)	<i>Opening a bank account.....</i>	21 (18%)

Q8.17 Have you been provided with information on the following?

	Yes	No
ROTL (temporary release)	117 (94%)	8 (6%)
Facility licence (outside work, education)	113 (93%)	9 (7%)
Resettlement licence (other outside activities such as arranging accommodation, work, family visits)	106 (89%)	13 (11%)
Earned community visits (town visits)	115 (92%)	10 (8%)

Q8.18 Have you had access to the following?

	Yes	No
ROTL (temporary release)	85 (71%)	35 (29%)
Facility licence (outside work, education)	86 (73%)	32 (27%)
Resettlement licence (other outside activities such as arranging accommodation, work, family visits)	82 (69%)	37 (31%)
Earned community visits (town visits)	89 (72%)	35 (28%)

Q8.19 Please answer the following questions on resettlement:

	Yes	No
Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	51 (40%)	76 (60%)
Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility, freedom etc)?	43 (34%)	84 (66%)
Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	121 (95%)	6 (5%)
Have you been on a preparation for release course?	34 (28%)	88 (72%)
Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	94 (77%)	28 (23%)

Is this prison near your home area or intended release address?

73 (59%)

51 (41%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Kirklevington Grange 2011

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

Key to tables

		HMP Kirklevington Grange	Open prisons comparator	HMP Kirklevington Grange 2011	HMP Kirklevington Grange 2005
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		131	1320	131	83
SECTION 1: General information					
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	1%	0%	0%
3	Are you on recall?	2%	3%	2%	
4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	11%	0%	0%
5	Do you have six months or less to serve?	45%	51%	45%	33%
6	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	2%	11%	2%	6%
7	Are you a foreign national?	2%	4%	2%	0%
8	Is English your first language?	98%	93%	98%	98%
9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	19%	27%	19%	16%
10	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	4%	2%	4%	
11	Are you Muslim?	12%	11%	12%	
12	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	1%	2%	
13	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	7%	10%	7%	
14	Is this your first time in prison?	50%	51%	50%	47%
15	Have you been in more than five prisons this sentence/remand time?	18%	14%	18%	
16	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	53%	55%	53%	43%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
For the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between prisons:					
1a	Was the cleanliness of the van good/very good?	44%	56%	44%	43%
1b	Was your personal safety during the journey good/very good?	61%	61%	61%	58%
1c	Was the comfort of the van good/very good?	14%	15%	14%	23%
1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	34%	33%	34%	33%
1e	Was the frequency of toilet breaks good/very good?	12%	12%	12%	15%
2	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	5%	9%	5%	8%
3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	65%	69%	65%	76%
4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	96%	87%	96%	95%
4b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	27%	22%	27%	54%
4c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	96%	93%	96%	100%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Kirklevington Grange	Open prisons comparator	HMP Kirklevington Grange 2011	HMP Kirklevington Grange 2005
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3	In the first 24 hours, did staff ask you if you needed help/support with the following:				
1b	Problems with loss of property?	13%	14%	13%	
1c	Housing problems?	13%	19%	13%	
1d	Problems contacting employers?	8%	11%	8%	
1e	Problems contacting family?	54%	46%	54%	
1f	Problems ensuring dependants were looked after?	7%	13%	7%	
1g	Money problems?	11%	15%	11%	
1h	Problems of feeling depressed/suicidal?	48%	37%	48%	
1i	Health problems?	58%	54%	58%	
1j	Problems in needing protection from other prisoners?	9%	14%	9%	
1k	Problems accessing phone numbers?	42%	36%	42%	
	When you first arrived:				
2a	Did you have any problems?	36%	47%	36%	15%
2b	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	5%	9%	5%	2%
2c	Did you have any housing problems?	4%	14%	4%	2%
2d	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	5%	2%	0%
2e	Did you have any problems contacting family?	8%	14%	8%	2%
2f	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	5%	1%	1%
2g	Did you have any money worries?	8%	15%	8%	10%
2h	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	2%	7%	2%	0%
2i	Did you have any health problems?	7%	14%	7%	1%
2j	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	0%	2%	0%	0%
2k	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	8%	13%	8%	
3a	Were you seen by a member of health services in reception?	76%	86%	76%	77%
3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	94%	82%	94%	90%
4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	84%	76%	84%	90%
	On your day of arrival, were you offered information on the following:				
5a	What was going to happen to you?	73%	60%	73%	73%
5b	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	53%	47%	53%	66%
5c	How to make routine requests?	73%	51%	73%	68%
5d	Your entitlement to visits?	75%	57%	75%	76%
5e	Health services?	72%	65%	72%	
5f	The chaplaincy?	64%	51%	64%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Kirkclevington Grange	Open prisons comparator	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2011	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2005	
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
On your day of arrival, were you offered any of the following:					
6a	A smokers/non-smokers pack?	85%	77%	85%	61%
6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	77%	63%	77%	79%
6c	The opportunity to make a free telephone call?	66%	51%	66%	55%
6d	Something to eat?	78%	76%	78%	84%
Within the first 24 hours did you meet any of the following people:					
7a	The chaplain or a religious leader?	44%	39%	44%	77%
7b	Someone from health services?	84%	80%	84%	87%
7c	A Listener/Samaritans?	9%	25%	9%	68%
8	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	10%	22%	10%	27%
9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	98%	92%	98%	100%
10	Have you been on an induction course?	98%	97%	98%	97%
For those who have been on an induction course:					
11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	82%	72%	82%	83%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:					
1a	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	79%	60%	79%	
1b	Attend legal visits?	68%	51%	68%	
2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	22%	28%	22%	27%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:					
3a	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	99%	97%	99%	100%
3b	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	45%	78%	45%	85%
3c	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	63%	70%	63%	79%
3d	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	80%	78%	80%	86%
3e	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	66%	50%	66%	69%
4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	79%	37%	79%	95%
5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	64%	51%	64%	59%
6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	87%	86%	87%	83%
6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	98%	91%	98%	98%
7	Have you made an application?	92%	84%	92%	92%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Kirklevington Grange	Open prisons comparator	HMP Kirklevington Grange 2011	HMP Kirklevington Grange 2005
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody continued					
For those who have made an application:					
8a	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	87%	73%	87%	89%
8b	Do you feel applications are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	83%	69%	83%	87%
9	Have you made a complaint?	12%	30%	12%	33%
For those who have made a complaint:					
10a	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	40%	39%	40%	63%
10b	Do you feel complaints are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	42%	47%	42%	68%
11	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	15%	21%	15%	4%
10c	Were you given information about how to make an appeal?	14%	19%	14%	46%
12	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	52%	42%	52%	74%
13a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	55%	57%	55%	63%
13b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	65%	63%	65%	67%
14	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	82%	56%	82%	98%
15a	Is there a member of staff in this prison that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	87%	75%	87%	98%
15b	Do most staff in this prison treat you with respect?	88%	73%	88%	99%
SECTION 5: Safety					
1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	6%	16%	6%	4%
2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	2%	5%	2%	
4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	4%	8%	4%	8%
Since you have been here, has another prisoner:					
5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	2%	4%	2%	2%
5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
5c	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%	0%	0%
5d	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	2%	0%	0%
5e	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%	0%	1%
5f	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	1%	0%	2%
5g	Victimised you because you were new here?	1%	2%	1%	0%
5h	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	0%	0%	0%	
5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	
5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	1%	0%	
5k	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	
5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	2%	1%	0%
5m	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	1%	1%	
5n	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%	0%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMP Kirkclevington Grange	Open prisons comparator	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2011	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2005
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
SECTION 5: Safety continued					
6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	12%	16%	12%	6%
	Since you have been here, has a member of staff:				
7a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	6%	7%	6%	4%
7b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7d	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	3%	2%	0%
7e	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7f	Victimised you because you were new here?	1%	5%	1%	1%
7g	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	0%	0%	0%	
7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	
7i	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	2%	3%	
7j	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	
7k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	2%	2%	2%
7l	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	2%	2%	
7m	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%	0%	
For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:					
8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	12%	23%	12%	0%
9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	5%	10%	5%	
10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	10%	16%	10%	
11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	30%	35%	30%	36%
SECTION 6: Health services					
1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	97%	60%	97%	
1b	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	99%	77%	99%	
1c	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	79%	27%	79%	
1d	Is it easy/very easy to see the optician?	65%	24%	65%	
2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	50%	50%	50%	
For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:					
3a	The doctor?	96%	71%	96%	83%
3b	The nurse?	98%	78%	98%	83%
3c	The dentist?	91%	57%	91%	87%
3d	The optician?	88%	57%	88%	80%
4	The overall quality of health services?	99%	67%	99%	81%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Kirkclevington Grange	Open prisons comparator	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2011	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2005
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
health care continued					
5	Are you currently taking medication?	44%	38%	44%	
For those currently taking medication:					
6	Are you allowed to keep possession of your medication in your own cell?	100%	96%	100%	
7	Do you feel you have any emotional well-being/mental health issues?	11%	13%	11%	
For those with emotional well-being/mental health issues, are these being addressed by any of the following:					
8a	Not receiving any help?	17%	26%	17%	
8b	A doctor?	58%	40%	58%	
8c	A nurse?	42%	32%	42%	
8d	A psychiatrist?	0%	7%	0%	
8e	The mental health in-reach team?	8%	25%	8%	
8f	A counsellor?	8%	9%	8%	
9a	Did you have a drug problem when you came into this prison?	8%	8%	8%	1%
9b	Did you have an alcohol problem when you came into this prison?	6%	7%	6%	1%
10a	Have you developed a drug problem since you have been in this prison?	1%	3%	1%	
For those with drug or alcohol problems:					
11	Do you know who to contact in this prison for help?	100%	93%	100%	
12	Have you received any help or intervention while in this prison?	93%	85%	93%	
For those who have received help or intervention with their drug or alcohol problem:					
13	Was this intervention or help useful?	100%	81%	100%	
14a	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison? (Yes/don't know)	5%	10%	5%	2%
14b	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison? (Yes/don't know)	6%	9%	6%	2%
For those who may have a drug or alcohol problem on release, do you know who in this prison:					
15	Can help you contact external drug or alcohol agencies on release?	100%	73%	100%	100%
SECTION 7: Purposeful activity					
1	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
1a	A prison job?	75%	76%	75%	
1b	Vocational or skills training?	35%	21%	35%	
1c	Education (including basic skills)?	38%	30%	38%	
1d	Offending behaviour programmes?	9%	10%	9%	
2ai	Have you had a job while in this prison?	98%	92%	98%	
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:					
2aii	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	60%	45%	60%	
2bi	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	90%	77%	90%	
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:					
2bii	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	82%	70%	82%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Kirklevington Grange	Open prisons comparator	HMP Kirklevington Grange 2011	HMP Kirklevington Grange 2005
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Purposeful activity continued					
2ci	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	95%	83%	95%	
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:					
2cii	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	79%	70%	79%	
2di	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	82%	68%	82%	
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:					
2dii	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	54%	52%	54%	
3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	50%	56%	50%	45%
4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	74%	63%	74%	70%
5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	77%	69%	77%	81%
6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	65%	49%	65%	68%
7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	84%	77%	84%	82%
8	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	36%	19%	36%	55%
SECTION 8: Resettlement					
1	Do you have a personal officer?	98%	64%	98%	99%
For those with a personal officer:					
2	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	79%	74%	79%	91%
For those who are sentenced:					
3	Do you have a sentence plan?	84%	68%	84%	94%
For those with a sentence plan?					
4	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	87%	72%	87%	98%
5	Can you achieve some/all of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	90%	83%	90%	
6	Are there plans for you to achieve some/all your targets in another prison?	26%	30%	26%	
7	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you address your offending behaviour while at this prison?	54%	33%	54%	
8	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	54%	31%	54%	
9	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	12%	21%	12%	8%
10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	15%	10%	15%	6%
11	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	68%	50%	68%	71%
12	Did you receive one or more visits in the last week?	49%	47%	49%	
For those who have had visits:					
13	How are you and your family/ friends usually treated by visits staff? (Very well/well)	86%	68%	86%	
14	Have you been helped to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	79%	50%	79%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Kirklevington Grange	Open prisons comparator	HMP Kirklevington Grange 2011	HMP Kirklevington Grange 2005
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Resettlement continued					
15	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with the following:				
15b	Maintaining good relationships?	33%	22%	33%	
15c	Avoiding bad relationships?	22%	16%	22%	
15d	Finding a job on release?	65%	53%	65%	92%
15e	Finding accommodation on release?	43%	48%	43%	80%
15f	With money/finances on release?	35%	35%	35%	79%
15g	Claiming benefits on release?	39%	46%	39%	79%
15h	Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	50%	40%	50%	80%
15i	Accessing health services on release?	33%	35%	33%	81%
15j	Opening a bank account on release?	43%	39%	43%	
16	Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following on release from prison?				
16b	Maintaining good relationships?	3%	5%	3%	
16c	Avoiding bad relationships?	1%	4%	1%	
16d	Finding a job?	33%	32%	33%	
16e	Finding accommodation?	15%	23%	15%	
16f	Money/finances?	13%	20%	13%	
16g	Claiming benefits?	11%	18%	11%	
16h	Arranging a place at college/continuing education?	3%	10%	3%	
16i	Accessing health services?	6%	9%	6%	
16j	Opening a bank account?	18%	18%	18%	
17	Have you been provided with information on the following:				
17a	ROTL (release on temporary licence)	94%	78%	94%	92%
17b	Facility licence (outside work, education)	93%	59%	93%	95%
17c	Resettlement licence (other outside activities e.g. work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	89%	60%	89%	95%
17d	Earned community visits (town visits)	92%	76%	92%	99%
18	Have you had access to the following:				
18a	ROTL (release on temporary licence)	71%	63%	71%	75%
18b	Facility licence (outside work, education)	73%	41%	73%	83%
18c	Resettlement licence (other outside activities e.g. work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	69%	42%	69%	76%
18d	Earned community visits (town visits)	72%	61%	72%	86%
19	Please answer the following about resettlement:				
19a	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	40%	24%	40%	75%
19b	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here? (Increased responsibility)	34%	27%	34%	47%
19c	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	95%	82%	95%	98%
19d	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	28%	19%	28%	44%
19e	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	77%	63%	77%	96%
19f	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	59%	45%	59%	60%



Diversity analysis
Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMP Kirklevington Grange 2011

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

Key to tables

<div style="background-color: green; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block; margin-right: 5px;"></div> Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better <div style="background-color: blue; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block; margin-right: 5px; margin-top: 5px;"></div> Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse <div style="background-color: orange; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block; margin-right: 5px; margin-top: 5px;"></div> Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details <div style="width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block; margin-right: 5px; margin-top: 5px;"></div> Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners				
						Number of completed questionnaires returned			
1.7	Are you a foreign national?	4%	1%	0%	1%				
1.8	Is English your first language?	96%	98%	93%	98%				
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			94%	8%				
1.1	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	5%	0%	4%				
1.11	Are you Muslim?	63%	1%						
1.13	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	0%	8%	0%	8%				
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	46%	51%	47%	50%				
2.1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	29%	35%	40%	32%				
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	52%	68%	56%	65%				
2.4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	96%	96%	100%	96%				
3.1e	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?	46%	56%	56%	54%				
3.1h	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?	42%	50%	38%	51%				
3.1i	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?	50%	60%	50%	60%				
3.2a	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	47%	34%	33%	37%				
3.3a	Were you seen by a member of health care staff in reception?	68%	78%	63%	79%				
3.3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	96%	93%	93%	95%				
3.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	92%	83%	88%	84%				

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.7b	Did you have access to someone from health care within the first 24 hours?	75%	86%	81%	85%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	96%	98%	94%	98%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	100%	98%	100%	99%
4.1a	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	92%	76%	100%	75%
4.3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	99%	100%	98%
4.4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	71%	81%	67%	81%
4.5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	50%	67%	53%	64%
4.6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	83%	88%	87%	87%
4.6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	100%	98%	100%	98%
4.9	Have you made a complaint?	17%	10%	0%	12%
4.13a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	52%	55%	71%	53%
4.13b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	74%	63%	93%	61%
4.14	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	88%	81%	100%	80%
4.15a	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	92%	86%	100%	85%
4.15b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	79%	90%	87%	88%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	8%	6%	13%	5%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	0%	2%	0%	2%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	4%	4%	0%	4%
5.5d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	0%	0%	0%
5.5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%	0%	0%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
5.5j	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	0%	0%	0%
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	20%	11%	25%	11%
5.7d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	8%	1%	6%	2%
5.7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%	0%	0%
5.7i	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	12%	1%	19%	1%
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	0%	6%	0%	5%
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	25%	7%	31%	7%
5.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	16%	33%	19%	32%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	96%	97%	94%	97%
6.1b	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	100%	99%	100%	99%
6.2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	46%	51%	47%	51%
6.5	Are you currently taking medication?	40%	44%	44%	43%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional well-being/mental health issues?	12%	11%	13%	11%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	76%	74%	69%	76%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	32%	35%	19%	38%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	32%	40%	25%	40%
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	16%	8%	6%	10%
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	56%	49%	69%	48%
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	88%	70%	88%	72%
7.5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	56%	83%	69%	79%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
7.6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	60%	67%	69%	64%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	92%	83%	100%	83%
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	25%	39%	20%	38%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	100%	97%	100%	97%
8.9	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	8%	13%	6%	12%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	24%	13%	19%	15%
8.18	Have you been provided with information on the following?:				
8.18a	ROTL (release on temporary licence)	96%	93%	100%	93%
8.18b	Facility licence (outside work, education)	96%	92%	100%	92%
8.18c	Resettlement licence (other outside activities e.g. work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	96%	88%	100%	88%
8.18d	Earned community visits (town visits)	88%	93%	94%	92%
8.19	Have you had access to the following?:				
8.19a	ROTL (release on temporary licence)	70%	71%	67%	71%
8.19b	Facility licence (outside work, education)	86%	70%	87%	70%
8.19c	Resettlement licence (other outside activities e.g. work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	70%	69%	67%	69%
8.19d	Earned community visits (town visits)	74%	71%	73%	71%
8.20	Please answer the following about resettlement:				
8.20a	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	32%	42%	31%	41%
8.20b	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here? (Increased responsibility)	20%	37%	25%	35%
8.20c	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	96%	95%	100%	95%
8.20d	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	21%	30%	38%	27%
8.20e	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	22%	67%	33%	63%



Diversity analysis - age
Key question responses (age - over 50) HMP Kirklevington Grange 2011

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

Key to tables

		Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		15	116
1.7	Are you a foreign national?	0%	2%
1.8	Is English your first language?	87%	99%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	0%	22%
1.1	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	4%
1.11	Are you Muslim?	0%	14%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	13%	6%
1.13	Is this your first time in prison?	36%	51%
2.1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	36%	33%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	87%	62%
2.4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	100%	96%
3.1e	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?	58%	53%
3.1h	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?	50%	48%
3.1i	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?	67%	57%
3.2a	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	30%	37%
3.3a	Were you seen by a member of health care staff in reception?	93%	74%
3.3b	When you were searched in reception was this carried out in a respectful way?	100%	93%
3.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	86%	84%

Diversity analysis - age

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.7b	Did you have access to someone from health care within the first 24 hours?	93%	83%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	100%	97%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	100%	98%
4.1a	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	93%	77%
4.3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	98%
4.4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	87%	78%
4.5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	67%	63%
4.6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	80%	88%
4.6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	100%	98%
4.9	Have you made a complaint?	33%	9%
4.13a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	93%	50%
4.13b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	86%	62%
4.14	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	87%	82%
4.15a	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	80%	88%
4.15b	Do most staff in this prison treat you with respect?	87%	89%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	7%	6%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	0%	2%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	7%	3%
5.5d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	0%
5.5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%

Key to tables

Diversity analysis - age

		Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
5.5j	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	0%
5.5k	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	0%
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	27%	10%
5.7d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	3%
5.7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
5.7i	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	4%
5.7j	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	0%
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	7%	4%
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	7%	10%
5.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	53%	26%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	100%	97%
6.1b	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	100%	99%
6.2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	21%	53%
6.5	Are you currently taking medication?	73%	40%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional well-being/mental health issues?	13%	10%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	67%	76%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	33%	35%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	27%	40%
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	13%	9%
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	73%	47%
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	40%	78%

Diversity analysis - age

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
7.5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	79%	77%
7.6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	67%	65%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	71%	86%
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	53%	34%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	93%	98%
8.9	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	20%	11%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	20%	15%
8.18	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
8.18a	ROTL (release on temporary licence)	93%	94%
8.18b	Facility licence (outside work, education)	92%	93%
8.18c	Resettlement licence (other outside activities e.g.. Work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	86%	90%
8.18d	Earned community visits (town visits)	86%	93%
8.19	Have you had access to the following:		
8.19a	ROTL (release on temporary licence)	64%	72%
8.19b	Facility licence (outside work, education)	62%	74%
8.19c	Resettlement licence (other outside activities e.g. work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	54%	71%
8.19d	Earned community visits (town visits)	60%	73%
8.20	Please answer the following about resettlement:		
8.20a	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	47%	39%
8.20b	were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here? (Increased responsibility)	20%	36%
8.20c	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	80%	97%
8.20d	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	20%	29%
8.20e	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	67%	58%