

Report on an announced inspection of

La Moye Prison, Jersey

11–15 February 2013

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Glossary of terms

We try to make our reports as clear as possible, but if you find terms that you do not know, please see the Glossary of terms on our website at: http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/about/hmipris/Glossary-for-web-rps_.pdf

Crown copyright 2013

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

Contents

	Introduction	5
	Fact page	7
	Healthy prison summary	9
1	Safety	19
<hr/>		
2	Respect	31
<hr/>		
3	Purposeful activity	45
<hr/>		
4	Resettlement	51
<hr/>		
5	Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice	59
<hr/>		
	Appendices	
<hr/>		
	I Inspection team	66
	II Prison population profile	67
	III Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	70

Introduction

This is the first visit to Jersey by my inspectorate since September 2005. Arrangements to plan the inspection began in early 2012 at the initiation and invitation of the Jersey authorities. Independent inspection of places of custody are an essential pillar of governance in any accountable criminal justice system, ensuring the health and wellbeing of facilities, but also providing public assurance through openness and transparency. At this inspection we found an institution that had been transformed, both physically and in terms of improved practice, from the prison we inspected eight years ago. This has been achieved despite the ongoing and considerable challenge of providing the full range of custodial services in just one place.

La Moye was a safe prison. All categories of prisoners, including women and young adults, reported positively about feeling safe, and the number of violent incidents recorded was low. Use of force was also falling. There were comparatively few incidents of self-harm but some practice, and in particular individualised care planning, needed to improve. The segregation unit was a poor facility and at odds with standards we found elsewhere in the prison, and some aspects of its practice needed to be more accountable. Some security practices were also, in our view, disproportionate.

Although rare, it was possible for detainees under the age of 18 to be held in La Moye. This fell well short of accepted practice and standards prevalent in the UK. Bluntly, children should not be held in adult prisons and alternative arrangements should be made. It was also our view that there were significant disadvantages in keeping separate the very few young adults held in La Moye. Integrating them with the rest of the population would limit their relative isolation and improve their access to the regime and other services. Overall, the prison needed to rethink its approach to the custody of younger prisoners.

Most of the accommodation we inspected was very new and of a very high standard. Most, but not yet all, of the very poor older accommodation had been decommissioned. Women were kept in a small facility separate to the men's side of the prison and, again, environmental standards were very high. The excellent quality of staff-prisoner relationships was a key strength of the prison, but this had not been exploited to develop structures or strategies that could support or promote diversity. Prisoners felt respected but there was a need to improve engagement with the needs of minority groups. Similarly, while the small number of women prisoners were well cared for, services could be improved by a more careful and active consideration of their specific needs in custody.

The prison regime and the quality of learning and skills provision were very good. Most prisoners had very good access to time unlocked, although we were surprised to find about a fifth still locked in their cells during the working day. The range of education and vocational training was good and the quality of teaching impressive. The achievement of qualifications by prisoners was outstanding. As with other aspects of the prison, however, we were concerned that provision for young adults and especially for women needed to be better considered so that their needs were not marginalised.

The prison had a traditional approach to resettlement, although this was not completely without merit. Strategically, plans and governance were weak but informal arrangements had allowed services to develop. Prisoners had sentence plans and the prison had good links with community services, such as probation. However, there was a need for a greater focus in sentence planning on risk of harm reduction and in ensuring responsibility was taken for helping prisoners achieve their targets. The prison also needed to be more confident about its

use of temporary release to support resettlement. Public protection arrangements and reintegration planning were generally very good.

Overall this is a very good report. La Moye is well led, and outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good or better in all our tests of a healthy prison. The prison was far better organised than we found when we last visited, and the stability of the institution was clearly evident. If criticism is to be made, it is that the prison had adopted a quite paternalistic approach to prisoner care, although we clearly discerned a platform from which it could further progress. A more developed and considered engagement with the needs of minorities – not least young people and women prisoners – should be high on the list of new priorities.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

April 2013

Fact page

Task of the establishment

A prison accommodating all offender categories: male and female convicted and remand adults (including determinate sentence prisoners) and young offenders and children and young people.

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

Public

Region/Department

States of Jersey Prison Service, Channel Islands

Number held

154

Certified normal accommodation

270

Operational capacity

270

Date of last full inspection

2005

Brief history

HMP La Moye was designed in the late 1960s to accommodate prisoners on remand and those sentenced to terms of less than 18 months; however, it did not actually open until 1975. It is the only prison in Jersey. The first modern style accommodation (H wing) opened in 2004. The next phase was completed in 2006 and provided a new kitchen and J wing. In 2009, further developments included a sports hall and gym, an all weather pitch and more cellular accommodation (K and L wings). A new visits centre and staff training and rest facilities were set to open in March 2013.

Short description of residential units

G wing – outworkers	27 spaces
H wing – all-female prisoners (15-year-olds to adults)	35 spaces
J wing – vulnerable prisoners	62 spaces
K1 and K2 wings – male adult standard remand and convicted	32 spaces
K3 wing – male (15- to 21-year-olds)	26 spaces
L wing – male adult standard and enhanced prisoners	88 spaces

Name of governor/director

Bill Millar

Escort contractor

States of Jersey Police

Health service commissioner and providers

La Moye prison (commissioner/provider)

York House surgery (provider)

Learning and skills providers

La Moye prison

Board of visitors chair
Jurat Robert Kerley

Healthy prison summary

Introduction

HP1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, immigration detention facilities and police custody.

HP2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

HP3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports 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, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely

Respect prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many

areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of prisoners. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.

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

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

HP5 Our assessments might result in one of the following:

- **recommendations:** will require significant change and/or new or redirected resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be checked for implementation at future inspections

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

- **examples of good practice:** impressive practice that not only meets or exceeds our expectations, but could be followed by other similar establishments to achieve positive outcomes for prisoners.¹

Safety

HP6 Prisoners, including women and young adults, spoke positively about feeling safe. Reception staff were caring and supportive although there were no peer workers. First night and induction arrangements were adequate and met basic needs. There were few serious violent incidents and reported bullying was lower than at comparator prisons. The number of self-harm incidents was low although more individual care planning was required. The environment at La Moye was not appropriate for young people under the age of 18. Some security arrangements were disproportionate. The availability of drugs was low, as was the demand for detoxification and clinical treatment. Disciplinary procedures were administered fairly. The use of force had decreased, but governance arrangements required improvement. Segregation conditions were poor. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

HP7 Apart from prisoners complaining that the escort vehicle was dirty, transfer times were short and relationships with escorting staff were described positively; however, it was inappropriate that women were transported with men.

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

- HP8 Reception was clean and, while holding rooms were bare and would have benefited from displaying useful information, it was an appropriate space. Some prisoners stayed there for too long, but staff interactions we observed were friendly and genuinely caring. Prisoners were complimentary about their treatment. First night risk assessments and health care screenings were sound. Induction was not particularly engaging and lacked structure and peer involvement, but we were assured that all new arrivals received it.
- HP9 Most respondents in our survey and groups, including women and young adults, reported feeling safe, and there were few incidents of violence. Reported bullying was low; however, formal monitoring arrangements and interventions for those that occurred were underutilised. The management of vulnerable prisoners was good.
- HP10 There were fewer incidents of self-harm than at comparator prisons. Risk and concerns assessment (RCA) and management care plans were focused on processes and needed to pay more attention to individual care; we had concerns about the management of some complex cases. Access to Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to support those at risk of self-harm) and the Samaritans was limited, especially 24-hour Listener support. Too few of these peer workers were in post to provide reasonable support. There was an over-reliance on cells with video cameras for the management of those at risk of self-harm and governance relating to the use of video camera cells was poor.
- HP11 There was no formal policy covering the safeguarding of adult prisoners considered to be at risk but staff were aware of those at risk. Although there were no young people under 18 in custody during the inspection, children should never have been held at the prison. The environment was unsuitable and staff lacked the specific skills required to offer appropriate support and guidance.
- HP12 Some security arrangements were disproportionate, including aspects of prisoners' movement to activities and strip-searching; women should only ever be strip-searched in exceptional circumstances. Closed visits were used infrequently and for reasons properly related to visits, but some prisoners remained on them for too long. The availability of drugs was low and very few prisoners said it was easy to get illegal drugs.
- HP13 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was administered fairly and was well understood by staff and prisoners. The differences between privilege levels were meaningful. Warnings, sanctions and demotions were based on poor behaviour patterns and not on individual incidents, and prisoners were given sufficient opportunities to improve before action was taken. The basic level lacked individual targets and was applied inconsistently but was used sparingly and mostly for short periods.
- HP14 The number of adjudications was lower than in comparator prisons and records showed that charges were usually justified; however, records of hearings failed to reflect sufficient investigation before a finding of guilt.
- HP15 The number of incidents where force was used had declined between 2011 and 2012 and was now similar to comparator prisons. Planned interventions were routinely filmed, but quality assurance was weak as videos were not routinely reviewed, and some we watched caused us concern in respect of control and restraint techniques.

- HP16 The segregation unit was in a very poor state of repair. We were not assured that its use was always necessary. Too many prisoners supported by an RCA were located in segregation without any exceptional reasons for this. Beyond daily showers, exercise and access to a phone, the regime was limited and governance arrangements were poor. Relationships between staff and prisoners were good, but this was not always reflected in records. The segregation unit was not sufficiently supervised at night. The women's facility was adequate but had rarely been used and we questioned its necessity.
- HP17 Demand for drug treatment was relatively low, but detoxification arrangements were not sufficiently responsive to prisoners' individual needs. Prisoners with drug and/or alcohol problems could access support services easily, but there was limited evidence of consistent harm reduction advice.

Respect

- HP18 Most residential units, including the women's accommodation, were good, but improvements were required on G wing and in the segregation unit. Staff-prisoner relationships were among the best we have observed and staff demonstrated a good knowledge of their population. Strategic management of equality and diversity was poor and there was a general lack of communication with minority groups and, in particular, with women. However, most prisoners from minority groups reported that staff treated them respectfully. Faith and religious service provision for most prisoners was adequate, but there was no provision for Muslim prisoners. A good basic health care service was available to all. Food was good, as was the prison shop provision; however, women felt there were too few gender specific products. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.
- HP19 The newer units were clean and bright, but some exercise yards were austere and seemed at odds with good accommodation standards. Cells were properly furnished and well maintained and most had adequate toilet screening. We were pleased to hear that there were plans to decommission G wing, as the accommodation, communal showers and toilets were poor. The women's unit (H wing) had in-cell showers, which the women appreciated. On other units access to clean communal showers was good. There was good access to clothes, laundry facilities, cleaning materials and telephones. Cell bells generally received a prompt response. Although applications were not always freely available, they were well managed.
- HP20 Relationships between staff and prisoners were impressive, striking the right balance between custody and care. The personal officer scheme worked well and staff were knowledgeable about those in their care, but this was not reflected in history sheets. Only a small number of prisoners were involved in regular wing-based consultation arrangements, but the prison was responsive to consultation findings although there was a need to ensure the specific concerns raised by women were being properly considered.
- HP21 Strategic management of equality and diversity was poor, although the allocation of new resources was positive and we acknowledge the drive to move forward in this area. There was no specific communication with prisoners from minority groups. In our survey, black and minority ethnic prisoners were more negative about victimisation, and many of those we spoke to felt disadvantaged when compared to

Jersey-resident prisoners. Most prisoners from minority groups were satisfied with their treatment and were positive about staff treating them with respect; however, provision and support for foreign national prisoners was poor. The prison was unaware of the number of disabled prisoners and, apart from health care input for self-disclosed medical conditions, support for disabled prisoners was poor.

- HP22 The enclosed environment for young adults on K3 wing meant that some of the benefits of the otherwise good accommodation were limited and the regime was inadequate. Little had been done to understand and address the specific needs of women. On the whole, staff reacted positively to requests, but improved consultation and a more proactive approach to identifying needs was required.
- HP23 The chaplaincy was adequately resourced, but there was no provision for Muslim prisoners. Access to weekly worship was unrestricted and there were a number of well attended weekly faith classes. Facilities for worship were good.
- HP24 The number of formal complaints submitted was low and most prisoners were satisfied with the process, but the confidential access system was unsuitable. Preferred names were not usually used by the respondent and we found some replies that were curt. We found a small number of complaints against staff and we were not assured that investigations were sufficiently robust. Legal services were limited, but access to legal visits was good.
- HP25 Health services were good and most aspects had improved, although governance could have been enhanced by a formal relationship with Jersey's health and social services department. With the exception of dental provision, prisoners were satisfied with the health care service. Arrangements for the storage of clinical records and therapeutic equipment were unacceptable. The health centre was too small and the use of the laundry room on H wing as a medicines room was unacceptable. The cleanliness of most health care rooms was exceptional.
- HP26 Despite there having been no health needs analysis, primary care services seemed appropriate. Ante-natal care was appropriate and there were established protocols, though little used, for mothers and babies. The dental service was comparable with the community, but capacity was inadequate and there was a long waiting list. Pharmacy services were good and the staff impressive, but there was a problem with trading in prescribed medicines. It was unacceptable that prisoners with mental health problems were housed in the segregation unit and that delays in transferring them to health service beds were frequent. Mental health services were otherwise satisfactory.
- HP27 The kitchen was clean and well maintained and prisoners working there could attain qualifications. Most prisoners said that the quality of the food was good and portion sizes adequate. We found that the menu was varied. Consultation arrangements were satisfactory. With the exception of some specific products for women prisoners, the prison shop arrangements were good.

Purposeful activity

- HP28 Prisoners were offered adequate time out of their cells, with fully employed prisoners receiving around 10 hours. There was a sound learning and skills strategy and a

varied and flexible curriculum with a good range of courses, and prisoners' achievements were impressive. There was sufficient vocational training but the range available to women was limited. Women and prisoners on K wing also had limited work opportunities. The library was accessible and spacious and provision was very good. Physical education (PE) was well managed with impressive facilities and high levels of attendance. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

- HP29 Employed prisoners received a good 10 hours out of their cells every day; unemployed prisoners received around four hours. In roll checks conducted during the core day, we found an average of 20% of prisoners locked up, which was higher than we expected. Regular opportunities for exercise and association were rarely cancelled and there was very little regime slippage.
- HP30 Management of learning and skills and work was good and there had been a significant improvement in resources and the range and quality of provision since our last inspection. Senior managers were very experienced and continued to lead improvement.
- HP31 Activities allocations along with minimal waiting lists were well managed. Pay was equitable and did not disadvantage prisoners who attended education or vocational training. Communication between education, work and vocational training staff was good, although more needed to be done to fully integrate learning and skills and resettlement.
- HP32 Quality improvement processes were in place, although observations of teaching and learning required further development. The self-assessment process was new and not yet fully developed and data was insufficiently used to inform decisions. There were sufficient activity places for most prisoners, although due to regime restrictions, prisoners on K wing only had limited access to the full range of work.
- HP33 The range of education and vocational training programmes was good for most and had improved significantly but, was still limited for women. Learning and skills staff offered good advice and guidance during induction. Basic initial assessments of literacy and numeracy were thorough and information was used effectively to provide support where needed. However, the take up of support for those who required classes in English for speakers of other languages was low and staff were actively seeking ways of engaging these prisoners more effectively. Women and young adults said that the learning and skills provision was too narrow for their needs.
- HP34 Teaching, learning and assessment across the provision were mostly good and sometimes outstanding. Most lessons were meticulously planned and were challenging and stimulating. Resources were good and generally well used.
- HP35 Staff provided very good additional learning support and prisoners benefited from effective outreach support for functional skills in English and mathematics in workshops and on the wings, although insufficient use was made of peer mentors to support learners in classes. Prisoners on Open University and distance learning courses received excellent support. The majority of prisoners had good in-cell access to digital interactive intranet, television and radio; these were in the advanced stages of development to allow prisoners to use a wide range of learning materials and interact more purposefully with staff.

- HP36 The achievement of qualifications was outstanding and the majority of prisoners who started a course completed it successfully. Attendance and punctuality was good and most prisoners in education and vocational training classes demonstrated high quality skills.
- HP37 The library was particularly good. It was well resourced, spacious, bright and comfortable, with a broad range of books and other appropriate material. Prisoners had good access to the library. The Storybook scheme, enabling prisoners to record a story for their children, was well used and there were plans to introduce reading groups and the Six Book Challenge, a national reading scheme.
- HP38 Recreational PE was outstanding, and prisoners were positive about it. Staff were highly motivated, well qualified and experienced. Approximately 88% of prisoners used the provision regularly and there was exceptionally good access for women. The promotion of healthy living was good, and there was a wide range of accredited PE courses. Pass rates were exceptionally high and there was good development of personal, social and employability skills for prisoners on sports leader courses. The facilities, newly built since our last inspection, were particularly good.

Resettlement

- HP39 There was no up-to-date strategic plan for resettlement but informal arrangements had led to solid progress in developing services. More work was required to enhance links with other related service providers. Sentence planning arrangements were generally good, although there was a lack of clarity regarding how the establishment would ensure targets would be achieved. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) assessments were robust, but the criteria were quite restrictive. Public protection arrangements were sound. All reintegration pathways were broadly covered, although support at the actual point of release was limited. Visits arrangements were adequate and the opening of a new improved facility was welcomed. The range of programmes was good. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.
- HP40 Although the prison had updated its service standard document for resettlement, the actual policy, while comprehensive, had not been updated since 2008 and needed reviewing. There was no strategic resettlement management group incorporating all resettlement providers, although it was evident that more informal arrangements had been developed; the programme management meeting covered some wider aspects of resettlement.
- HP41 Strategic links had been developed with the Jersey community and there were good links with the island's probation service, especially with regard to the management of public protection, but the integration of other service providers remained limited and required further development. Nevertheless, overall the prison had developed a good model of offender management and resettlement.
- HP42 Sentence planning arrangements for all prisoners serving more than six months were well organised and appropriately focused, although there should have been a greater emphasis on risk factors. Despite this, it remained unclear whose responsibility it was to drive sentence planning targets forward. The role of personal officers also remained both unclear and variable.

- HP43 The probation service had developed good links and service provision with continuity in the community for those returning to live in Jersey. Both psychology and probation services were able to offer one-to-one work with prisoners and there was some focus on work with sex offenders and those with a history of domestic violence.
- HP44 Arrangements for assessing prisoners for ROTL were comprehensive although it was disappointing that few prisoners met the criteria, especially with regard to working out, which was invariably restricted to Jersey residents.
- HP45 Public protection arrangements were good and all prisoners were assessed to determine their level of risk and whether they needed to be managed through the community-based Jersey multi-agency public protection arrangements or through the internal multi-agency risk assessment and management meeting. Reviews were appropriately frequent and focused.
- HP46 All prisoners were invited to the bi-monthly resettlement 'marketplace' prior to release. Although the prison's approach was positive and work had improved significantly, there was little subsequent follow-up to establish what support was actually taken up at the point of release and immediately afterwards.
- HP47 Support for those with housing needs at the point of release was limited. There was no prison-based provider, although two community-based services offered support primarily to Jersey residents and as a consequence very few prisoners were released without accommodation. There were appropriate arrangements for resettlement into education, training and work, although links with employers were insufficient, as were those between the resettlement and learning and skills departments. Pre-release health care of prisoners was generally good.
- HP48 Information sharing between the police and health services on prescribing regimes and risk assessments undertaken in custody was good, but the care of prisoners in contact with both health and drug and alcohol services was not sufficiently well coordinated.
- HP49 Finance and debt support was acceptable and prisoners could receive support from the Citizens Advice Bureau on debt management; the education department offered courses relating to personal finance and budget management. Further financial advice and savings programmes were available through a local credit union that could be accessed through the resettlement marketplace.
- HP50 Visits arrangements were appropriate, although the visits hall was quite limited in its provision of services and the quality of its environment. However, the anticipated move to an impressive new building should mitigate many of these limitations. It was disproportionate that prisoners had to wear coloured sashes for security reasons. There were no extended family visits. It was, however, planned that these would be introduced with the new visits arrangements.
- HP51 Prisoners could address their offending behaviour through an appropriately wide range of programmes. The planned introduction of the thinking skills programme (TSP) in April was likely to meet the majority of presenting needs. Waiting lists for programmes were high, with almost half the population identified for the TSP.

Main concerns and recommendations

HP52 Concern: Although rare, a lack of alternative facilities meant that it was possible for young people under the age of 18, both boys and girls, to be held in Le Moye, an adult prison. The prison had no specialist provision in the delivery of custodial services to this age group.

Recommendation: The States of Jersey should make alternative arrangements for holding children in custody.

HP53 Concern: The segregation unit was in an extremely poor condition. It was not decent and the special cell, locally referred to as a quiet cell, was an out-of-date facility that was not required.

Recommendation: The segregation unit should be decommissioned or completely refurbished and the quiet cell should be taken out of use permanently.

Section 1: Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Prisoners felt safe during transit and journeys were short, but the vehicle used by the police was dirty. Relationships with escorting staff were good. It was inappropriate that women and men were transported to the prison together.
- 1.2 In our survey more prisoners than at comparator prisons said they felt safe during transit. Relationships with escorting staff were respectful, journeys were short and prisoners were disembarked promptly. The only escort vehicle used was dirty, but we were told that it was to be replaced shortly after the inspection. Women were transported in the same vehicle as men, which was inappropriate as we were not assured that this afforded them protection from harassment.

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.3 Reception was clean but holding rooms were stark and some prisoners spent too long there. Relationships between staff and prisoners were very good. All prisoners were inappropriately strip-searched when there was no supporting intelligence. First night risk assessments and health care assessments were sound. First night cells were properly prepared. Induction was uninspiring and took too long to complete but all new arrivals received it and, while it provided the basic information, it could have been significantly improved.
- 1.4 The small reception was clean and staff managed the diverse population efficiently. Holding rooms were devoid of any reading material or televisions to occupy new arrivals, who often remained there for long periods. All prisoners entering or leaving through reception were strip-searched when there was no intelligence to support this (see section on security), but our survey indicated that more prisoners than in comparator prisons felt this was done respectfully. Reception staff were focused on the individual needs of women. Women were also strip-searched when passing through reception but were kept separate in a discrete area, brought down at the last minute and accompanied by staff at all times.
- 1.5 Relationships between staff and prisoners were very good and we observed some genuinely caring interactions. Late receptions were rare. Regardless of the time of arrival, health care staff assessed all new arrivals in a suitably confidential environment and a senior officer

interviewed them to identify any immediate concerns or vulnerabilities. Cell-sharing risk assessments were completed by reception staff and were of a good standard.

- 1.6 Prisoners were given something to eat and drink and could shower in reception and it was good that, shortly before the inspection, all new arrivals started to be given £2 of non-repayable telephone credit so that they could make a free call. There were no peer support workers and the lack of Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to support those at risk of self-harm) was a concern. There was no dedicated first night centre, but new arrivals were located in clean, well prepared cells.
- 1.7 In our survey, fewer prisoners than in comparator prisons said they had completed an induction. The induction programme lacked structure. A member of staff met with individual prisoners to explain each aspect of the comprehensive information booklet. The lack of peer involvement or use of multi-media made it dull. Other agencies and departments, including the chaplaincy, education and drug and alcohol support services visited prisoners soon after their arrival to undertake individual assessments. While we were assured that all aspects of an adequate induction programme were completed, record keeping and delivery required improvement. We were advised that it took between seven and 10 days to complete the induction programme, but this involved long periods when prisoners were not actively engaged and were locked in their cells.

Recommendations

- 1.8 Reception holding rooms should be equipped with material to keep prisoners occupied and prisoners should remain in reception for the shortest possible time.
- 1.9 Format, delivery and record keeping for the induction programme should be improved and when not actively involved in induction prisoners should be unlocked.

Housekeeping point

- 1.10 Listeners should be in reception when new arrivals are received.

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 which inform all aspects of the regime.

- 1.11 Most prisoners felt safe. There were few incidents of violence or bullying, but formal monitoring arrangements were underutilised. Vulnerable prisoners were well managed.
- 1.12 In our survey, 18% of male respondents, compared with 40% in comparator prisons, said they had ever felt unsafe and only 3% (16% in comparator prisons) said they felt unsafe at the time of the inspection. Throughout the inspection prisoners, including women and young adults, told us they felt safe. There had been six assaults and one fight in the previous six months, which was low for this type of prison. The prison had conducted a violence reduction survey, which

reflected prisoners' positive feelings about safety. However, some responses required further exploration and had not been used to inform the violence reduction strategy.

- 1.13 Bullying incidents were much lower than at comparable prisons. Investigations into all types of violent and antisocial behaviour, including bullying, were conducted by the safer custody officer and were of a satisfactory standard. Despite a number recommending formal monitoring, only one prisoner had been subject to such procedures in the preceding six months and targets that were set were not tailored to the individual. The safer custody officer felt that he lacked the authority to ensure that recommendations were implemented.
- 1.14 The monthly safer custody meeting was chaired by the safer custody officer rather than a senior manager. The committee monitored progress regarding both violence reduction and suicide and self-harm strategies but some potential indicators of violence were not considered. For example, there was no analysis of where violent incidents occurred or numbers of applications from those prisoners requesting own protection.
- 1.15 Vulnerable prisoners were located on J wing, which provided similar accommodation to that for prisoners in the normal location. Despite there being no mixing of the two populations, there was little difference in their respective access to the regime. Vulnerable prisoners we spoke to in groups and on the wing said they felt safe.

Recommendation

- 1.16 Formal monitoring arrangements for perpetrators of antisocial behaviour should be used when investigations recommend this and targets should be tailored to the individual.

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

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

1.17 Incidents of self-harm were low but individual care required improvement. The safer custody strategy did not focus on the specific needs of the diverse population. Too many prisoners supported by risk and concern assessment (RCA) documents were located in the care and control unit (CCU). There was an over-reliance on cells with video cameras. Women in crisis felt unsupported. Listener and Samaritan access was insufficient.

- 1.18 The number of self-harm incidents was low with only three instances in the previous six months. RCA documents were used to monitor those at risk of suicide or self-harm and had been opened on 36 occasions in the six months to December 2012. RCA documents we sampled were mostly process driven and observational rather than focusing on individual need or risk reduction. Not all reviews were multidisciplinary and many lacked individual care assessments or evidence of meaningful staff engagement. Prisoners subject to RCA documents attended a review 36 hours after monitoring was established, but they did not attend subsequent reviews, which potentially diminished the effectiveness of outcomes.

- 1.19 The safer custody strategy did not focus on the specific needs of the diverse population. The safer custody meeting did not monitor risks for individual groups, such as women or young adults. Monitoring of prisoners placed in anti-ligature clothing and non-standard accommodation, including cells with video cameras, was poor and we were not assured that their use was always justified or that they were used as a last resort (see section on use of force). There was some monitoring and analysis of trends and patterns of self-harm, but no evidence that the data collected had been used to inform the strategy.
- 1.20 There was an over-reliance on cells with video cameras for the management of those at risk of suicide or self-harm, which appeared to have been used as an alternative to constant watches. During 2012, according to the 80 RCA documents, 17 prisoners had been placed in cells with video cameras. Videos were not constantly watched and, although prisoners were told this, we were concerned that some, in a heightened state of vulnerability, could self-harm in the expectation that they were being constantly monitored.
- 1.21 Too many prisoners subject to suicide and self-harm monitoring were located in the CCU without exceptional reasons to justify this. Many of these were complex cases, including those assessed as having had mental health issues. There had been no constant watch of a prisoner in crisis since August 2011; this had taken place in the CCU, which was inappropriate when alternative locations existed. The CCU environment did not provide suitable support for those at risk of suicide or self-harm (see section on segregation).
- 1.22 Only two trained Listeners were available in the prison at the time of the inspection and their access to those in crisis was limited to adult male prisoners, at times of general unlock, and with no out of hours arrangements. A Samaritans helpline was introduced on the final day of the inspection. Services for women and young adults were even worse – they could only receive support from the Samaritans just twice a week.
- 1.23 Tragically two prisoners had taken their own lives at the prison since our last inspection. Formal investigations had been undertaken and action plans to reduce the risk of incidents were in place. However, we found little evidence of managers assuring themselves that required actions had been implemented.
- 1.24 Women were particularly negative in their responses about how the prison managed those in crisis. They believed that if they self-harmed they would always be placed in special accommodation rather than be offered alternative support. Some women in groups said that those who were self-harming may do so covertly rather than approach staff for help.
- 1.25 All staff we spoke with carried anti-ligature tools, which were handheld devices that would assist a member of staff to cut down a prisoner who was hanging. Staff told us they would have no hesitation in entering a cell on their own if they believed a prisoner's life was at risk.

Recommendations

- 1.26 Quality assurance and governance should be in place to make sure RCA documents are being used appropriately to ensure good care for prisoners at risk.
- 1.27 Access to Listeners and Samaritans should be improved.

Housekeeping point

- 1.28 Death in custody action plans should be reviewed regularly.

Care and protection of children and young people

Safeguarding

Expected outcomes:

The establishment promotes the welfare of children and young people, particularly those most at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.

1.29 Formal safeguarding arrangements were in place for children and young people (those aged 15 to 18). La Moye was not an appropriate place to hold those under the age of 18.

1.30 La Moye was designated to hold both sentenced male and female young people under the age of 18. While on remand, children and young people were held at the Greenfields centre, a dedicated local authority remand centre operated by specialist staff for the care of children. Once sentenced they were moved to the prison. Although it was rare for young people to be held at La Moye, this had occurred on a small number of occasions during 2012. Male young people were co-located with young adult prisoners or, in the case of female young people, with adult women, which was unacceptable. While needs assessments of young people could take place, staff lacked the specific skills required to offer appropriate support or useful interventions with a proper child focus. Despite adequate safeguarding and child protection arrangements, we considered La Moye to be an inappropriate place to hold individual, often isolated, children and young people properly (see main recommendation HP52).

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

The prison promotes the welfare of prisoners, particularly adults at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.²

1.31 There was no formal policy for the safeguarding of adults at risk.

1.32 Although the prison had a policy outlining the management of prisoners identified as vulnerable due to their conviction, there was no formal policy covering the safeguarding of adult prisoners considered to be at risk. New arrivals identified as at risk were seen by health care staff who assessed needs. There was some contact between the prison's mental health team and those based in the community, but there was none with local social services to ensure continuity of care. Staff's awareness of those considered at risk was good; they focused on relevant issues and took personal responsibility in protecting prisoners at risk.

² We define an adult at risk as a vulnerable person aged 18 years or over, 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'. 'No secrets' definition (Department of Health 2000).

Recommendation

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

Security

Expected outcomes:

Security and good order are maintained through an attention to physical and procedural matters, including effective security intelligence as well as positive staff-prisoner relationships.

Prisoners are safe from exposure to substance misuse while in prison.

- 1.34 Some security arrangements were disproportionate. Strip-searching was not always justified by intelligence or individual assessment of risk. Intelligence was well managed and illicit drug use was low.
- 1.35 Some security arrangements were disproportionate. Access to the regime was, for instance, unnecessarily restrictive and included five separate movements to activity. Male prisoners aged between 18 and 21, of which there were only three at the time of the inspection, moved at a different time to those aged over 21 without justification. Similarly, catalogue goods ordered directly from the supplier were not allowed, yet families could purchase items from catalogues and hand them in, putting prisoners without family in Jersey at a disadvantage.
- 1.36 Over 800 security intelligence reports (SIRs) had been submitted in the previous six months, which was impressive. These were processed efficiently with timely target searching, but little was found during these searches. The security committee was well attended and set and monitored appropriate security objectives.
- 1.37 The number of prisoners on closed visits was low; closed visits were appropriately implemented for reasons directly related to visits. However, reviews were insufficient and as a consequence some prisoners remained on closed visits for too long. Strip-searching prisoners without carrying out a risk assessment was routine on entry to the CCU and on entry to and exit from the prison, all of which was unnecessary (see also section on early days in custody).
- 1.38 Illicit drug use was low. In our survey, 10% of male prisoners said it was easy to get drugs (compared with 29% in comparator prisons) and only 2% thought it was easy to get alcohol (compared with 13% in similar prisons). The prison operated a compliance testing programme linked to the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, release on temporary licence (ROTL) and work and activities, and 20% of the population were swab tested every month. During the last six months, the positive rate averaged 2.8%. Finds and test results were mainly for diverted opiate-based medication. The prison had also introduced compulsory drug testing, which was intelligence-led and involved taking urine samples; under this programme a positive result or refusal led to disciplinary action. Alcohol testing was in place for prisoners returning from ROTL, but positive results were extremely rare.
- 1.39 Other supply reduction measures included SIRs, which were discussed with intelligence officers and, if appropriate, shared with the health care department. The prison had also introduced ion scanning, a body orifice security scanner chair, targeted searching and CCTV

coverage. Security staff attended drug strategy meetings, and communication and information sharing with other departments and services was good.

Recommendations

- 1.40 Security arrangements should be proportionate and based on risk assessments.
- 1.41 Prisoners should only be strip-searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion. Women should only be strip-searched in exceptional circumstances.

Incentives and earned privileges

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.42 The IEP scheme was fair and mostly well managed. The differences between the levels were sufficient to encourage positive behaviour. The regime for the few prisoners on the basic level was inconsistent and there was no managerial oversight of the scheme.
- 1.43 The IEP policy was comprehensive and broadly understood by staff and prisoners. There were four privilege levels: basic, standard, enhanced and super enhanced. At the time of the inspection, over 60% of prisoners were on an enhanced level and less than 0.5% on basic.
- 1.44 The distinctions in access to private cash, association, extra television channels, additional possessions and visits (and working outside the prison on temporary release for those on super enhanced) were sufficiently motivational. Super enhanced prisoners were generally located on G wing, which was poor accommodation, mitigated slightly because prisoners could move freely around the wing to access the kitchen, cardiovascular room and comfortable association area. Prison staff said that these prisoners could not access the main gym because of security concerns that peer pressure might mean they conveyed unauthorised contraband items between wings, which appeared disproportionate (see section on security). The small financial bonus for the highest level was reasonable.
- 1.45 In our survey, more respondents than in comparator prisons felt the scheme was fair. We found that the scheme was mostly administered appropriately. Warnings were issued for proper reasons, and prisoners were given sufficient opportunities to improve before any formal action was taken.
- 1.46 The basic level was used sparingly, but for those who were demoted there were no individual targets to help them improve. Reviews were not always timely but most stayed on this level for relatively short periods. It was inappropriate that segregated prisoners were automatically demoted to the basic level. The regime for those on basic was inconsistent, but for some included access to activity and limited periods of association, while others were inappropriately only able to exercise on their own. There was no managerial oversight to ensure that the scheme was applied consistently.

Recommendations

- 1.47 Basic level prisoners should be set individual targets, given timely reviews and have access to a consistent regime.
- 1.48 There should be adequate managerial oversight of the IEP scheme.

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.49 Adjudication numbers were low but records did not demonstrate sufficient investigation before a finding of guilt. Governance of use of force, strip-clothing and segregation was poor and not all use was justified. The CCU was inappropriate.

Disciplinary procedures

- 1.50 In 2012, there had been 252 adjudications, which was low compared with similar prisons. Records showed that charges were appropriately laid for offences that warranted formal disciplinary procedures. Approximately 40% of charges related to disobeying an order or threatening or abusive behaviour. Prisoners placed on report had association curtailed until the adjudication hearing regardless of the alleged offence, which was often unnecessary.
- 1.51 Adjudications were not held in a suitable room and many took place in wing offices, which was inappropriate. Prisoners were given enough time and information to prepare for hearings but legal advice was discouraged. Although adjudication processes appeared to demonstrate appropriate levels of investigation, these were not clearly detailed in written records. Punishments were overseen by the deputy governor and appeared fair, but governance arrangements were weak with no published tariffs, adjudication standardisation meetings or quality assurance processes in place. Prisoners were advised of the appeals process.

Recommendations

- 1.52 Prisoners should be able to access legal advice.
- 1.53 The prison should implement adjudication standardisation meetings, published tariffs and quality assurance procedures.

Housekeeping points

- 1.54 Association should only be curtailed for those placed on report in exceptional circumstances.
- 1.55 Adjudications should be held in a suitable room.

- 1.56 Records of adjudications should reflect sufficient investigation.

The use of force

- 1.57 The recorded number of incidents involving force had decreased from 54 in 2011 to 39 in 2012. Nearly 80% of recorded incidents did not involve full restraint.
- 1.58 Use of force documentation was variable. Much of it did not provide proper justification for the use of force or record attempts to de-escalate a situation. Relocation to the segregation unit was routine, but the use of handcuffs during such removals, was not. Prisoners were not routinely debriefed after an incident. All planned interventions were filmed but not reviewed and in some of the videos we watched, we identified some concerns regarding control and restraint techniques. No formal quality assurance measures were in place and there was no use of force committee.
- 1.59 The identified authorised special accommodation had not been used since 2010 but we considered other cells in the segregation unit to be special accommodation as they were unfurnished. The prison held no records on the number of prisoners placed in strip-conditions. Governance of the use of unfurnished cells and strip-clothing was inadequate.

Recommendation

- 1.60 **Governance of use of force, including special accommodation, strip-clothing and planned interventions, should be improved.**

Segregation

- 1.61 The environment of the male CCU was extremely poor, in a state of disrepair and unsuitable. The communal areas, including the exercise yard, were bleak and depressing. The unit consisted of 14 cells plus a certified special accommodation cell. Two unfurnished cells with no toilet, sink or furniture and a third, which had just a toilet, were used to accommodate all new arrivals to the CCU regardless of the reason for them being placed there. Prisoners not serving an award of cellular confinement who complied with the regime could progress to cells that were furnished and had electricity and which, at the time of the inspection, were being refurbished. The special accommodation cell, or quiet cell as it was known, was particularly grim with a glass block window and three doors between it and the rest of the unit. Although this cell had not been used since 2010 we believe its use at any time was inappropriate. The regime in the CCU was limited beyond access to daily showers, exercise and phone calls (see main recommendation HP53).
- 1.62 The number of people moving to the CCU was low – 53 in six months – but we were not assured that all uses were necessary, as in the case of six prisoners supported by RCA documents where there were no exceptional reasons to justify this. All new arrivals to the unit were strip-searched regardless of risk.
- 1.63 Prisoners being held on good order or discipline (GOOD) were subject to a three-tier privilege scheme, which they could progress through based on behaviour. Progression to the top tier meant access to in-cell sanitation if available. This scheme was particularly harsh and contributed to the impoverished regime. There were frequent multidisciplinary reviews, but the prisoner did not attend them, and a management rather than an individual care-based approach was taken. Governance arrangements for segregation needed to improve as it was

not clear from some paperwork why prisoners had been held in the unit and on whose authority.

- 1.64 In our survey, 79% of male prisoners, compared with 38% in comparator prisons, said they were treated well by staff in the CCU. We saw good relationships between staff and prisoners on the unit and prisoners in our groups confirmed this. However, this was not reflected in sampled daily history sheets and electronic case notes. There was no dedicated group of staff who worked in the CCU and this affected continuity of care for those located there.
- 1.65 Supervision of the CCU when it was open at night was not sufficient. Only one member of staff supervised the unit and two other locations.
- 1.66 Women who were segregated were placed in new accommodation based on H1 landing. It was bright, clean and contained in-cell showers. This area had rarely been used and we questioned its necessity.

Recommendations

- 1.67 Prisoners supported on RCA documents should only be located in the CCU in exceptional circumstances.
- 1.68 Governance arrangements for the use of segregation, including GOOD, the regime and staffing should be improved.

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.69 Relatively few new arrivals required detoxification but a standardised treatment regime did not always meet the individual needs of opiate-dependent prisoners. There was a lack of GP specialists who could manage substance misuse and comprehensive assessments or reviews did not take place. Drug and alcohol counselling and offending behaviour courses were available, but harm reduction advice was not provided consistently.
- 1.70 During 2012 a total of 84 prisoners completed detoxification: 37 were treated for alcohol, 34 for opiate and 13 for benzodiazepine dependence; these numbers were quite low for a local prison. Following reception screening and testing, detoxification regimes began immediately.
- 1.71 Treatment was standardised and opiate users were prescribed a 12-14-day regime of dihydrocodeine. We spoke to several men and women who had habitually used high amounts of heroin before being in custody; they said that the detoxification regime did not adequately meet their needs. Prisoners on methadone in the community could not continue their treatment and only two were allowed to complete their buprenorphine (subutex) regime in the past year. A 20-day buprenorphine detoxification protocol was still in draft form.
- 1.72 None of the GPs had specialised in treating substance dependency and there was no evidence of comprehensive assessments, individual care plans or treatment reviews except for those with very complex needs. Prisoners experiencing both mental health and substance-

related problems were referred to a community psychiatric nurse who had a substance misuse background; there was good access to this service.

- 1.73 The prison did not have a designated detoxification unit and prisoners were either located on K1, the induction landing, or on the wings. Night observation was undertaken by prison officers and while this was not ideal, nurses were on call.
- 1.74 The drug strategy group met bi-monthly and was chaired by the deputy governor. Relevant departments were represented but staff from Jersey's community drug and alcohol service rarely attended. The substance misuse strategy and drug and alcohol policy document had been updated and covered both supply reduction and treatment and support services. A needs analysis had been carried out three years earlier, as a result of which two offending behaviour programmes were introduced: the Jersey alcohol-related violence intervention strategy (JARVIS) and Addressing Substance-Related Offending – Secure (ASRO-S). Last year, 33 prisoners completed these courses, but the waiting list stood at 37 (see section on resettlement).
- 1.75 Men and women had mixed views about drug and alcohol interventions. Some had found ASRO-S useful; others saw participation in offending behaviour programmes as 'ticking boxes' for sentence planning and ROTL. Prisoners are asked to complete feedback reports after every programme and the prison conducts an annual survey.
- 1.76 The prison's drug and alcohol counselling service had within the previous six months become part of the resettlement and sentence planning unit. Interventions were coordinated during fortnightly meetings and substance misuse work was well integrated into sentence planning.
- 1.77 Prisoners could easily access drug and alcohol support and 46 were actively engaging with the service. In addition to one-to-one work, they could participate in a seven-session alcohol study group, but there was no drug awareness or harm reduction module; since case files and client records were not accessible we could not find evidence that this area was covered on an individual basis. Alcoholics Anonymous self-help groups met weekly on G, K and L wings, which allowed all prisoners to attend. Narcotics Anonymous groups were not available and the prison had not developed a peer support scheme for those with drug problems.

Recommendations

- 1.78 A GP with a special interest in the management of substance misuse should be engaged to develop clinical protocols for opiate substitute treatment, including stabilisation, detoxification and maintenance prescribing regimes, which are in line with best practice.
- 1.79 Comprehensive assessments, care plans and reviews that demonstrate patient involvement should be developed.
- 1.80 A drug and alcohol needs analysis should be undertaken.

Housekeeping points

- 1.81 The drug and alcohol service should provide prisoners with good quality drug awareness and harm reduction information.

- 1.82 All staff delivering drug and alcohol services should be subject to case management reviews and supervision to ensure accountability and professional standards.

Section 2: Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners live in a safe, clean and decent environment within which they are encouraged to take personal responsibility for themselves and their possessions. Prisoners are aware of the rules and routines of the prison which encourage responsible behaviour.

- 2.1 La Moye housed a diverse range of prisoners in new purpose-built residential units which offered a good standard of living accommodation. Cells were clean and spacious. In-cell showers on H wing were appreciated by the women who lived there, but showers elsewhere lacked privacy. Cell call bells generally received a prompt response. Applications were well managed. There were plans to decommission the dilapidated G wing.
- 2.2 With the exception of G wing, which remained a poor environment, all residential units had been built since our last visit. At the time of the inspection, La Moye housed a diverse range of sentenced and remand prisoners, including adult men, women and young adults. H wing was a discrete facility for women, which offered comfortable single cells including en-suite showers and toilets. Young adults were located in single cells on the top landing of K wing but were separate from the rest of the wing. Adult male prisoners were spread across the rest of the wings in single and double cells.
- 2.3 Communal areas across the prison were clean, bright and well maintained. Cells, including double cells, were clean, spacious and properly furnished. Adequate toilet screening was in place on all wings except J wing, where shower curtains did not provide sufficient screening. Most outside areas were pleasant but exercise yards on K and L wings appeared unfinished and unpaved. G wing was dilapidated and accommodation lacked integral toilets. Communal showers and toilets were poor (see paragraph 1.44). We were pleased that there were plans to decommission this unit. The inappropriate displays policy was widely understood by staff and robustly enforced.
- 2.4 In our survey, prisoners responded more positively than those in comparator prisons to a range of questions around access to facilities in residential units. En-suite showers on H wing were appreciated by the women who lived there. In other units, access to clean communal showers was good but they lacked privacy. Prisoners could wear their own clothes and access to laundry facilities and cleaning materials was good. Records of cell call bells, our own observations and positive survey results assured us that call bells generally received a prompt response. Access to telephones was adequate.
- 2.5 Each cell was equipped with information technology known as 'IX', which gave prisoners access to the television and opportunities to continue education courses (see section on learning and skills) and there were positive plans to develop the capacity of this system. Applications were not freely available on all wings but were managed well and prisoners were broadly satisfied with the system.

Recommendations

- 2.6 Exercise yards on K and L wings should be properly paved and finished, and seating and recreational equipment should be provided.
- 2.7 There should be sufficient privacy screening for all communal showers and J wing in-cell toilets.

Housekeeping points

- 2.8 Application forms should be freely available on all wings.
- 2.9 The plans to decommission G wing should be accelerated.

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are treated with respect by staff throughout the duration of their time in custody, and are encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions.

- 2.10 Relationships between staff and prisoners were a real strength. The personal officer scheme worked well, but written records of engagement required improvement. Consultation arrangements were well developed but some women did not feel the prison was responsive to their particular needs (see paragraph 2.26 and recommendation 2.30).
- 2.11 In our survey, more prisoners than in comparator prisons responded positively to a range of questions about being treated respectfully. We observed some impressive interactions between staff and prisoners, including some genuinely caring and empathic treatment. Staff's use of first or preferred names was well embedded during interactions, but less so in written records.
- 2.12 Staff understood the personal officer scheme and in our survey more prisoners than in the comparator said they had a personal officer and a member of staff they could turn to for help. Staff we spoke to were knowledgeable about the personal circumstances not only of those for whom they were the personal officer, but others in their care. Personal officers were involved in sentence planning arrangements. Staff entries in prisoners' records were infrequent and did not reflect the good knowledge they had of individuals.
- 2.13 Regular wing-based consultation arrangements were well established and had effected some changes. It was, however, disappointing that women told us they did not feel their views on some issues were taken into account. For example, access to products specifically for women in the prison shop, which had been discussed, had not been addressed until raised by inspectors when action was eventually taken (see sections on equality and diversity and purchases).

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic³ are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

2.14 In the two weeks prior to our inspection, the prison had started to formulate structures that would promote equality and diversity, but no work had been undertaken in previous years. Despite this most prisoners from minority groups felt that they were treated well. Work on protected characteristics was wholly underdeveloped and consultation was not in place.

Strategic management

- 2.15 The head of residence had overall responsibility for equality and diversity and up until November 2012 when an officer was identified to assist for four hours a week, there was no staff support for a number of years. The part-time equalities officer was making steady progress, ensuring that a strategy was in place and that staff were trained.
- 2.16 A new policy, which was being used to promote equality and diversity, had been published in the weeks leading up to the inspection. However, it was too early to make an informed judgement about its effectiveness. Prior to this work there were no structures or processes to underpin equality and diversity.
- 2.17 An equality action plan was being developed but it was not ready to be used. Equalities meetings had not taken place and there was no equalities committee to oversee the process. Equalities monitoring and equalities impact assessments were not in place.
- 2.18 Prisoners were not involved in equalities and there were no formal communication forums for any minority group. There was an over-reliance on wing prisoner councils to deal with equality issues, but the minutes we reviewed did not mention equality and diversity.
- 2.19 Discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) had been introduced in the weeks before the inspection; before this, formal complaint forms had been used to report alleged incidents. No complaint forms or DIRFs had been submitted on equality and diversity issues during the past 12 months. The prison had started to provide staff with 'Challenge It Change It' diversity training; 15% of staff had completed the training to date.

Recommendation

- 2.20 The prison should implement an equality and diversity strategy with solid structures and including monitoring, impact assessments and regular communication with prisoners from all protected characteristics.

³ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

Protected characteristics

- 2.21 Black and minority ethnic prisoners accounted for 9% of the population. Prisoners from minority groups who we spoke to said that they were treated well; in our survey, all minority groups were positive about staff treating them with respect. However, they were negative when asked about victimisation. They said that there was a perception that prisoners who were Jersey residents were treated more favourably when it came to access to G wing, the resettlement wing, and release on temporary licence (ROTL). The prison did not record prisoners from a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller background.
- 2.22 There were 45 foreign national prisoners at the time of the inspection, representing 17 different nationalities. There was no policy on foreign national prisoners and no work had been undertaken with this group. Those we spoke to said that they were treated well at the prison, but many talked about problems with the Jersey immigration service and said they were frustrated because the service wouldn't deal with them or see them until they had 12 months left to serve. External independent immigration advice or support was available.
- 2.23 Six per cent of prisoners were Muslim and those we spoke to said they were content with how they were dealt with by staff. There had been no Muslim chaplain in place for a lengthy period and as a result Friday prayers did not take place (see faith and religious activity).
- 2.24 Our survey showed that 10% of the population considered themselves to have a disability. The prison was unaware of the total number of disabled prisoners it held as prisoners had no way of disclosing their disability during their induction. The health care department dealt with those prisoners who did disclose a disability during their stay, but care was purely medical and there was no involvement from the other prison departments. There was no strategy to ensure personal emergency evacuation plans were in place for those that required them. There were two adapted cells and shower areas on both K and L wings.
- 2.25 At the time of the inspection there were three young adult prisoners being held. Young adult prisoners were held on K3 landing, which was completely screened off from the rest of the wing, making it an oppressive and isolated environment. Opportunities for young adult prisoners away from the landing were very limited and all three prisoners said they felt completely isolated. They could attend the gymnasium four times a week, but only with each other, which meant they could not participate in team games or interact with other prisoners. Exercise took place twice a day, but there was no opportunity to exercise with the rest of the population. Two of the prisoners were on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme and during association could use the enhanced room, which left the remaining prisoner to associate on his own. Although the prison had not held young people under the age of 18 for a number of months, they would also have been held on K3 landing, which as described would not be a suitable environment for them. Fifteen prisoners were over the age of 60; no support or specialist regimes were available to them.
- 2.26 Women prisoners were held separately from the rest of the prison on H wing. They told us staff treated them well on the wing. Many women prisoners were frustrated that their needs were often not understood by the prison, and they lacked opportunities throughout the prison, particularly in education and vocational training. The prison had not consulted women prisoners and was unaware of any of their specific needs.
- 2.27 In our survey, 4% of respondents identified themselves as gay or bisexual; the prison did not keep up-to-date accurate records. No support was in place. There had been one transgender prisoner during the previous few years and their treatment was suitable and met their needs.

Recommendations

- 2.28 The prison should implement a separate foreign national strategy that ensures the needs of all foreign national prisoners are regularly met.
- 2.29 The prison should consider integrating young adult prisoners with adult prisoners across the establishment.
- 2.30 The prison should work with women prisoners to better understand their needs and formulate a regime that meets these needs.

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.

- 2.31 Faith provision for most prisoners was good with the majority having very reasonable access to worship and faith study groups. The lack of a Muslim chaplain, however, meant that support for Muslim prisoners was lacking.
- 2.32 The chaplaincy consisted of a part-time Roman Catholic chaplain and a part-time Church of England chaplain, supported by a number of community volunteers. There had been no Muslim chaplain in place for a long period of time resulting in very limited pastoral provision for Muslim prisoners who comprised nearly 6% of the population.
- 2.33 The chaplaincy was well integrated and delivered good provision for Christian faith prisoners, including corporate worship and pastoral care. We found that access to religious services was unrestricted and in our survey, 59% of prisoners, compared with 47% in comparator prisons, said that it was easy to attend religious services. Individual arrangements were made for those who were unable to attend, such as segregated prisoners.
- 2.34 The chapel was small but adequate for the number attending worship and classes. A range of religious study groups and other activities took place weekly.

Recommendation

- 2.35 The prison should ensure that the faith needs of Muslim prisoners are met.

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.

- 2.36 There were few formal complaints and procedures to manage the complaints system were satisfactory. Prisoners expressed confidence in how their concerns were addressed. However, quality assurance arrangements needed improvement and complaints against staff required a more thorough investigation.
- 2.37 General complaint forms were readily available on residential wings and boxes where they could be deposited were accessible and secure. The confidential access system did not always ensure confidentiality as there was no independently secure system and we were not assured they would always be opened by the correct manager.
- 2.38 Thirty complaints were submitted during the previous six months, which was low. Most prisoners we spoke to were content with the process, and in our survey, 53% of respondents, compared with 33% in comparator prisons said that they felt complaints were dealt with fairly. In our survey, 62% of respondents, compared with 36% in comparator prisons, said that complaints were dealt with promptly.
- 2.39 We reviewed all the complaints submitted during the previous six months and most responses were timely and addressed the complaint raised. Preferred names were not used in replies, but most were fair, although we did observe a small number of curt replies. We found a small number of complaints against staff where the investigation and response were perfunctory and did not reflect that complaints had been taken seriously.
- 2.40 Data monitoring only took into account the location of and reasons for the complaint, and this provided very little useful information about the different needs or issues of distinct prisoner groups.

Recommendations

- 2.41 Confidential complaint forms should only be opened by an appropriate manager.
- 2.42 Investigations into staff-related issues should always be thoroughly investigated.

Housekeeping point

- 2.43 Replies to complaints should address prisoners by their preferred name and should always be polite.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.44 There were insufficient legal services in place, but access to legal visits was satisfactory.
- 2.45 There were no trained legal services officers at the prison, and prisoners received no legal information during induction. Prisoners could access legal advice through the Jersey judicial system and although this telephone number was on each prisoner's telephone account, it was

not advertised and many prisoners were unaware of it. In our survey, prisoners responded more positively to most questions about their legal rights than those in comparator prisons. Legal information was available in the prison library.

- 2.46 Access to and facilities for legal visits were satisfactory, with three comfortable rooms available. In our survey, more prisoners (72%) than in comparator prisons (41%) said that it was easy or very easy to communicate with their legal adviser.

Recommendation

- 2.47 Adequate legal services provision should be introduced.

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.

- 2.48 Health services were good and most aspects including staffing and the range of services had improved, although governance could have been enhanced. Except for dental provision, prisoners were generally very satisfied with health care. Arrangements for storing clinical records and therapeutic equipment were unacceptable as were some aspects of the health care rooms. Cleanliness was exceptional. Primary care services seemed appropriate to meet demands. The capacity of the dental service was inadequate and it had a long waiting list. Pharmacy services were good, but there was a problem with the diversion of prescribed medications. Mental health services were generally satisfactory but there were areas for improvement.

Governance arrangements

- 2.49 In our survey, prisoners were satisfied with health care except for dental care, which they repeatedly said did not meet their needs. There had been no health needs analysis since 2004.
- 2.50 The prison provided primary health services and was in the process of introducing its own standards for health. Heads of professions from States of Jersey health and social services offered guidance when approached, but there was no formal relationship with the prison health service; this was a potential weakness in governance arrangements. Governance issues such as serious incidents and complaints were taken to the prison senior management team for discussion. However, there was no accumulated recommendations or action plans in response to deaths in custody (see section on self-harm and suicide prevention). Health care staff contributed to prisoner forums on each of the wings. The health team was analysing the results of a patient survey at the time of our visit.
- 2.51 Health services were well managed by a senior nurse. There was a good skills mix within a team of registered nurses, doctors, administrative and discipline staff offering a seven-day service over extended hours. All nurses were up to date with mandatory training. Other forms

of essential training were offered, although it was proving a challenge to find training tailored to health in prisons. Staff were offered clinical supervision, but take up was not recorded; informal peer group supervision took place at the clinical staff meeting every two weeks.

- 2.52 There was a mix of paper-based and electronic clinical records. The practice of typing paper-based records into the electronic record was labour intensive. A new electronic records system was being introduced at the time of our visit and, it was hoped it would be developed to allow contemporaneous entries. Clinical records were subject to regular audit and were stored in several places; many were not being stored in fireproof cabinets and some, along with therapeutic equipment, were stored in a garden shed, which was completely unacceptable.
- 2.53 There were systems for the prevention of communicable diseases and a new policy – based on professional guidance and advice from the general hospital – was awaiting ratification. While the introductory health booklet told patients that clinical information would be shared as appropriate, no formal protocol for information sharing had been agreed with other agencies except for Jersey multi-agency public protection arrangements.
- 2.54 All prisoners had equal access to health services. There was a health centre and wing-based consultation and treatment rooms. The health centre was too small and the amount of activity had outgrown the space. For example, good practice in siting dental decontamination equipment reduced flexibility in using a medical consultation room for primary care. Confidential meetings were occasionally interrupted because people walked through the manager's office to get from one area of health care to another, which was unacceptable. There was a plan to develop the health centre. Some wing-based rooms were of a good standard, others were not. Some of the problems had been addressed following an infection control audit; cleanliness was exceptional. The patients' waiting area was small but adequate. However, prisoners sometimes waited there for an hour before an appointment and longer after appointments. The reception health interview room was adequate.
- 2.55 We were informed that emergency services could enter the prison promptly if needed. Resuscitation equipment – external automated defibrillators (AEDs), airway support, oxygen and suction – was strategically placed throughout the prison. The equipment was checked regularly, but checks were not always documented. Eighteen custody staff had been trained in the use of AEDs and we were informed that there was one on duty at all times.
- 2.56 We observed outstanding relationships between prisoners and health care staff. Staff appeared to know every prisoner and could recall most prisoners' circumstances without recourse to the records.
- 2.57 Prisoners could see a doctor of the gender of their choice. Female patients had access to conventional ante-natal services; prisoners with babies could be transferred to UK prisons. There was no dedicated lead staff member for older prisoners' health, although there were dedicated health assessments for the over 50s. The prison agreed to appoint a lead staff member during our visit. Prisoners who required safeguarding were brought to the prison safeguarding officer's attention. Specialist aids to daily living were available following an assessment by a visiting occupational therapist.
- 2.58 Prisoners were given information about how to access health services at reception; it was available in several languages. The information was less accessible to those with reading difficulties. Prisoners knew how to make complaints about health care, although the system was shared with the general prison complaints system and did not guarantee medical confidentiality. There was one complaint per month in the last full year. Ninety per cent of

complaints concerned prescribing and medication; responses we sampled were focused and courteous.

- 2.59 There was evidence of health promotion activities in the health care centre and in the gym. However it was not systematic. Prisoners had access to age-related disease prevention programmes and screening programmes that mirrored UK campaigns. This included chlamydia and meningitis C for younger prisoners, hepatitis B for all patients, and lifelong disease and dementia screening for older adults. Smoking cessation support was available to all. There was a visiting hepatologist and specialist in blood borne viruses. Barrier protection was unavailable; its absence represented a potential threat to public health.

Recommendations

- 2.60 There should be a health needs analysis.
- 2.61 There should be a formal governance arrangement between the prison's health services and the States of Jersey health and social care department.
- 2.62 Clinical records should be stored confidentially and securely.
- 2.63 The health centre should be extended.
- 2.64 The complaints system should preserve medical confidentiality.
- 2.65 Barrier protection should be available to all prisoners who require it.

Housekeeping point

- 2.66 Information leaflets on health care should be accessible to prisoners with reading difficulties.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.67 Reception health screening and secondary assessments took place. The assessments were comprehensive and included an appointment with a GP. Contact was made with other care agencies, with the patient's consent, as necessary.
- 2.68 Care of prisoners with lifelong conditions was good, although more nurse-led activities could have been considered. Prisoners were involved in and consulted over planning for their own care and treatment. Effective triage was in place and was about to be enhanced by the availability of Odyssey (an electronic clinical decision-making system). Out-of-hours' cover was available on call, although nurses were available until 9pm, which meant out-of-hours' calls to GPs were uncommon. The appointments system was well managed and the failure to attend rate at less than 5% was impressive.
- 2.69 Primary services included: daily wing-based GP surgeries; nurse treatment clinics; lifelong condition reviews and clinics offered by visiting specialists, such as the chiropodist, physiotherapist and optician. Care was tailored to the individual. Patients requiring secondary care attended the local general hospital. On average, there were 10 hospital appointments per week which were well managed, prompt, and very rarely cancelled for security reasons.

Pharmacy

- 2.70 Pharmacy services were provided by an external supplier. Although pharmacy staff were impressive, patients did not have access to pharmacy clinics or reviews.
- 2.71 Most patients had medication in possession and, in all but one case, the risk assessment was attached to the prescription chart. Prisoners had access to in-cell storage lockers to store medications. Medicine rounds occurred twice daily, although medicines that were not held in possession were also administered at other times. Medicine charts we saw were generally well completed – we found just one chart that had gaps in recordings. We were told that, on occasion, one prisoner's supplies of antipsychotic medicines would be administered to another prisoner. To prevent the diversion of medication, gabapentin and pregabalin capsules were being opened by nurses and the content mixed into water for administration. This potentially meant that the medicines were being administered in an unlicensed form.
- 2.72 Pharmaceutical stock supply and management was good, although facilities were limited. Prescribing was safe. Apart from some medicines that were kept on shelves in the room on K and L wings, medicines on the wings were mostly stored in trolleys, all of which were secured to the wall, except for those on K and L wings. The trolleys were not in the same room as administration points and we had concerns about the personal security of nurses pushing medicine trolleys through congested prisoner association areas to get to the medical rooms. We observed medicine administration and issues of confidentiality were well managed. The use of the laundry room on H wing as a medicines administration room was unsafe and unacceptable.
- 2.73 A policy was in place for over-the-counter remedies, but the list of remedies contained several pharmacy-only medicines. It was inappropriate for pharmacy-only remedies to be available to individual prisoners on the over-the-counter list. Medicines administered in this way were recorded on the prisoner's chart. There were out-of-hours' medication boxes containing only paracetamol and antacids. These were given to prisoners who requested them as a single dose only out of hours. This was recorded and followed up by health personnel.
- 2.74 A medicines and therapeutics committee met three or four times a year, with good attendance from stakeholders. All policies had been reviewed prior to our visit. There were no patient group directions (PGDs) (which enable nurses to supply and administer prescription-only medicine). The prison did not have its own formulary (medications used to inform prescribing), but used the formulary for the States of Jersey, which was not necessarily suited to the prison environment. There was a discussion in the minutes about the illicit diversion of prescribed medications among prisoners and actions being taken to address this. Reference books were available, but most of those we found were not current.

Recommendations

- 2.75 The pharmacist should be supported to develop pharmacy-led clinics and medicine use reviews for the prison population.
- 2.76 Dispensing the medication of one prisoner to another is inappropriate and should stop immediately.
- 2.77 The administration of the contents of pregabalin and gabapentin capsules in water should be reviewed to ensure that it is safe, and robust written procedures put in place.

- 2.78 The medicines trolleys should be secured to the wall, kept locked when not in use, and their transportation through prisoner areas should cease to reduce security risks.
- 2.79 It is inappropriate for the laundry room to be used for medicines administration on H wing; alternative arrangements should be made.

Housekeeping points

- 2.80 Care should be taken to make full and complete records of the administration of medicines.
- 2.81 The list of medicines available as over-the-counter remedies should be reviewed by the medicines and therapeutics committee to ensure it complies with the current legislation.
- 2.82 A prison formulary that more accurately reflects the prison health needs analysis and prisoner population needs should be put in place.
- 2.83 The introduction of PGDs should be considered to enable nursing staff to supply more potent medication and to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. A copy of the original signed PGDs should be available in the pharmacy, which should be read and signed by all relevant staff.

Dentistry

- 2.84 The oral health of prisoners was poor, which, we were informed, reflected the general population. Sixty-one per cent of prisoners (94 patients) were on the waiting list. They waited up to 11 weeks to be seen although, following triage, urgent cases could be seen within one week. Capacity was inadequate and could not meet the demand. The dental staff were frustrated by the situation.
- 2.85 All patients were given advice on oral hygiene and support officers promoted oral health in the health centre. The States of Jersey rules on dental treatment precluded many interventions in the first six months of a sentence and some complex treatments thereafter. This reflected the limitations on States-aided dental treatment in the community. The dental surgery was well equipped but the room was too small. There were separate decontamination facilities but, because they were in a room used for primary care treatment, they could not comply with best practice in decontamination. Equipment was checked and certified as appropriate and the facilities had been subject to an infection control audit.

Recommendations

- 2.86 The health needs analysis should include an assessment of the requirement for dental services and treatments at the prison.
- 2.87 The dental surgery should be enlarged and the decontamination facilities should be in a separate room.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.88 Twenty-two per cent of custody staff had been trained in mental health awareness in the past two years. There was good work between custody and health care staff. Initial mental health

assessment was good. Primary care mental health services included: wing-based support from nurses, some of whom were registered mental and learning disability nurses; and independent counselling and self-help literature. There were no daytime support groups, but education was tailored to the individual so that a supportive environment could be offered. There was a regular meeting with visiting specialists from the States of Jersey community mental health team, which provided secondary level care. Visiting specialists included a community psychiatric nurse and psychiatrist; they had 16 prisoners on their combined case load. Prisoners had a variety of complex mental health problems. While the care programme approach was not in use, case management included comprehensive assessment and risk management. We were informed that the segregation unit was occasionally used (twice a year) to accommodate prisoners with serious mental health problems. The environment was anti-therapeutic and unsuitable. There were delays of several weeks in getting prisoners transferred to health care beds.

Recommendations

- 2.89 The segregation unit should not be used to provide ongoing care for patients with complex and serious mental health problems.
- 2.90 The transfer of patients to external mental health services should be expedited and occur within agreed good practice transfer guidelines timescales.

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.

- 2.91 Most prisoners were positive about the quality of the food. Arrangements in the kitchen were good and kitchen workers could attain qualifications. Wing serveries were clean and a varied five-week menu cycle was in place.
- 2.92 The kitchen was clean, appropriately laid out, well maintained and adequately equipped. Halal certificates were in place and the validity of the certification was checked regularly. There were separate storage and preparation areas, as well as separate utensils, for halal food. Up to 22 prisoners worked in the kitchen on a rota basis. Prisoners could attain a Scottish vocational qualification (SVQ) up to level 2. All staff and prisoners were appropriately trained and wore appropriate clothing. Wing serveries were clean. We observed a small number of prisoner servery workers who were not suitably dressed.
- 2.93 Menus operated on a five-week cycle, with a wide variety of options, including hot meals for both lunch and evening meals during the week. However, the printed menus did not specify which options were appropriate for religious diets. Prisoners were positive about both the quality and quantity of the food and in our survey, 52% of respondents, compared with 24% in comparator prisons said that the food was good.
- 2.94 Breakfast was served on the day it was consumed, lunch was served at midday, but the evening meal was served earlier than 5pm. Catering was discussed regularly at the prisoner

council meeting, and food comments books were used by prisoners and reviewed by the catering team at regular intervals.

Housekeeping points

- 2.95 Wing servery workers should be correctly dressed.
- 2.96 Printed menus for prisoners should identify religious options.
- 2.97 The evening meal should not be served before 5pm.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.98 The prison shop arrangements for most prisoners were good, but more products for female prisoners and religious items needed to be introduced.
- 2.99 The prison shop arrangements for most prisoners were reasonably effective, consultation took place at the prisoner council meeting and changes were made to the canteen list, where possible. Canteen products were purchased by the prison and prisoners used a canteen form to choose their weekly items. They were allowed to overspend if the prison was satisfied sufficient funds would arrive at the prison promptly.
- 2.100 In our survey, 75% of respondents, compared with 47% from comparator prisons said the shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs. We found that there were limited products for female prisoners, although the prison took steps to address this during our inspection. The number of religious items available for purchase was insufficient.
- 2.101 New arrivals were offered a canteen pack if they arrived without sufficient funds, and access to the canteen within 24-hours if they arrived with money. Prisoners could not purchase items from external catalogues, but items could be sent in through reception and prisoners could order newspapers and magazines every week.

Recommendation

- 2.102 There should be a wider range of goods for female prisoners and religious items should be available.

Section 3: Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in activities available during unlock, and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied activities.⁴

- 3.1 Time out of their cells for most was good, with fully employed prisoners achieving around 10 hours. Access to exercise and association was also good.
- 3.2 Survey results around access to time out of cell were more positive than in comparator prisons. A fully engaged prisoner could receive a good 10 hours out of their cell and an unemployed prisoner just over four hours. All prisoners, including those who did not attend activities, were unlocked every morning to carry out domestic tasks. All prisoners could exercise every morning and afternoon, but some exercise yards were stark and under developed (see section on residential units). Exercise sessions were rarely cancelled. Consistent association periods were available each evening during the week and at weekends, and association facilities were good.
- 3.3 In roll checks during the inspection, we found an average of 20% of prisoners locked up and unoccupied during the working day, which was higher than we expected, but mostly explained by prisoners who refused to participate in activities. The core day was generally adhered to and we found no evidence of regime slippage.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.4 There was a useful learning and skills strategy which was managed particularly well. Much had been done to improve the provision and the prison provided a varied and flexible curriculum with a good range of courses. Prisoners' achievements were impressive. There was a reasonable and improving variety of vocational training in place. The library was accessible and spacious and provision was very good. Physical education was well managed with impressive facilities and high levels of attendance. Outcomes for prisoners were good.

⁴ Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time prisoners are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

3.5 Ofsted⁵ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:

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

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.6 The management of learning and skills, education and work were particularly good and there had been substantial improvements in resources and the range and quality of provision since our last inspection. Senior managers were very experienced and their capacity to improve the provision further was outstanding. The governor and senior staff considered learning and skills to be central to the purpose of the prison. They had a clear strategic vision for this complex and challenging prison with a diverse population, and were investing in future initiatives. This included the further development of the already well-established in-cell prison digital media and intranet system to enhance prisoners' opportunities for learning. Internal working relationships and communications between education, work and vocational training staff were good, although more work was needed to fully integrate learning and skills and resettlement, and links with employers were underdeveloped (see section on resettlement). The range of vocational training available for women prisoners was limited. There were high levels of mutual respect between tutors, instructors and prisoners in learning and skills and work areas.
- 3.7 Appropriate quality assurance arrangements were in place, although self-assessment was new and not yet fully developed, and data were insufficiently used to inform management decisions. However, senior managers knew their provision well and recognised their strengths and areas for improvement. Suitable action plans were in place. Managers of learning and skills met regularly, although there was no clear agenda or focus, and meetings were not recorded. Observations of the quality of teaching and learning took place in education and physical education programmes, but had not been extended to other areas of learning and skills. Teaching staff were highly qualified and experienced, although there was insufficient sharing of best practice in teaching and learning. Learning resources were good and considerable investment had led to improved facilities in several areas since the last inspection.
- 3.8 The promotion of safeguarding prisoners and equality and diversity were good. Learning and skills staff were able to recognise and deal adequately with safeguarding and equality issues when they arose, and had received appropriate training.

Recommendations

- 3.9 Aspects of quality assurance, including self-assessment, management meetings and observations of teaching and learning, should be further improved.
- 3.10 The prison should improve the collection, analysis and use of learning and skills data to better inform management decisions.

⁵ Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

Provision of activities

- 3.11 There were sufficient purposeful activity places for most prisoners, although due to regime restrictions, women prisoners and prisoners on K wing only had limited access to work and were mostly employed as cleaners. Twenty-nine prisoners were unemployed; most were on remand or refused to work. The range of learning and skills provision for the small number of women and young adult prisoners was adequate, although they said that it was too narrow. Women prisoners only had sporadic access to courses in carpentry, industrial cleaning and painting and decorating. Most activities were part time, although some courses were full time, such as work in the kitchen. A high proportion, around 68% of prisoners, participated in accredited courses in education or training. Orderlies were deployed in a range of training and work areas, including the gym and kitchen, but insufficient use was made of peer support workers in education classes.
- 3.12 The range and variety of education and vocational training programmes was good and had improved significantly. This included courses in: art; customer service; information and computer technology; functional skills in English and mathematics; industrial cleaning; bricklaying; painting and decorating; carpentry; and catering. Most vocational training areas offered level 1 and 2 employability qualifications, which were appropriate for most prisoners. Although the quality of food preparation and cooking in the main kitchen was good, qualifications were only offered at level 1. Recognised vocational qualifications programmes in horticulture were due to start imminently. A good proportion of prisoners, around 12%, were engaged in Open University or distance learning courses, mostly at level 3 or above.
- 3.13 Learning and skills staff and representatives from the Jersey Careers Service provided good initial advice and guidance during induction. The initial assessment of literacy and numeracy was thorough and the information was used effectively to provide support where needed. However, take up of support for English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) was low, and staff were seeking ways of engaging with these prisoners more effectively. Allocations to activities, along with minimal waiting lists, were well managed and prisoners were promptly assigned to work following induction. Pay was equitable and did not disadvantage prisoners attending education or vocational training programmes.

Recommendations

- 3.14 The prison should continue to ensure that women and young adults have access to a full range of appropriate purposeful activities.
- 3.15 The prison should ensure that catering qualifications are offered at a higher level to provide learners with better employment prospects on release.

Quality of provision

- 3.16 There was good, and some outstanding, teaching, learning and assessment. Lessons, which were meticulously planned, were challenging and provided prisoners with clear targets. Learning in many classes was stimulating and exciting. Most prisoners produced work of a high standard and received clear feedback, as well as good additional learning support from staff when required. Those on distance learning or Open University courses were provided with excellent individual support. Prisoners made particularly good use of the continuously improving but already well developed in-cell virtual learning environment and intranet to

support their learning. They received particularly good outreach support for functional skills in English and mathematics in workshops and on the wings.

- 3.17 Education and vocational training resources and facilities were good. A new, purpose-built classroom and outdoor area was being completed to accommodate horticulture training, an exceptional facility. Resources were well used, although further staff training was required to make better use of electronic whiteboards in some lessons.
- 3.18 In areas such as art, bricklaying, painting and decorating and horticulture, high quality craft skills were demonstrated. In horticulture, for example, a wide variety of quality vegetables and herbs were produced, many of which were used for cooking in the prison kitchen.

Housekeeping point

- 3.19 Staff should be trained to ensure electronic whiteboards are used more effectively in lessons.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.20 Achievements of vocational qualifications were outstanding. Almost all prisoners completed their courses successfully and those who left early gained unit accreditation where this was available. The majority of learners developed good skills and produced high standards of finished work. Punctuality and class attendance were good. Learners used safe working practices in their work areas and on vocational and education programmes, and appropriate protective clothing and footwear were worn where required. However, no data was available to demonstrate what proportion of prisoners progressed into employment or education and training when they left (see section on resettlement).

Recommendation

- 3.21 **The prison should collect and use data regarding the proportion of prisoners who progress into employment or education and training on release to inform the variety of provision offered.**

Library

- 3.22 The library was particularly well managed and provided prisoners with an excellent service. It was open during the day and prisoners had access for approximately one hour each week. An exceptionally high proportion of prisoners, around 87%, used it regularly. The library was light, spacious and well equipped, and had comfortable seating areas, as well as separate rooms for private or quiet study and access to computers. A wide range of material was available, including fiction and non-fiction books, local and national newspapers, magazines, easy reads and classical literature. There was a good variety of education and vocational books for those on courses, and additional resources could be obtained through an inter-library loan service. Material catered for all prisoners and all reading abilities. Books were available in an appropriate range of languages to meet the needs of foreign national prisoners. Legal material relating to European and UK law was readily available, and a small selection of books was provided to those on G wing and in the segregation unit. Provision for the Storybook scheme, enabling prisoners to record a story for their children, was good and prisoners' involvement was high. There were imminent plans to introduce reading groups and the national Six Book

Challenge reading scheme. None of the prisoners were employed as library orderlies so that they could benefit from vocational training in this area.

Housekeeping point

- 3.23 The prison should consider employing prisoners as library orderlies and they should have the opportunity to complete an appropriate vocational qualification.

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.

- 3.24 Physical education (PE) was outstanding. Recreational PE and vocational courses were very well planned and managed. Staff were enthusiastic, experienced and highly qualified. PE was available to prisoners in the daytime, evening and at weekends and there was good provision for all. The proportion of prisoners who accessed PE regularly each week was outstanding at around 88%. Facilities were excellent and equipment was well maintained. Prisoners made good use of the outside all-weather football pitch for sport. A wide range of accredited vocational training was available and achievements were high. Links with the health care department were strong and the provision for remedial PE was particularly good.
- 3.25 Physical education (PE) was particularly well managed and promoted. Access was good for all prisoners and exceptional for women. A high proportion, approximately 88% of prisoners, used the facility regularly each week. New facilities had been built following the last inspection and included: a large sports hall; weight training and cardiovascular training suites; a well equipped classroom; an outside all-weather football pitch; and showers and changing rooms. These facilities for recreational, remedial PE, and vocational training were outstanding. Accommodation and equipment were well maintained and changing rooms and showers were clean. The dedicated PE classroom was well equipped and included a mobile electronic whiteboard, which was well used. A small range of appropriately serviced PE equipment was available for prisoners on G wing.
- 3.26 Staff were highly qualified with a broad range of experience and could deliver a wide range of recreational PE and vocational qualifications. The variety of programmes available was good and prisoners could progress from level 1 introductory PE to level 3. Approximately 39 prisoners were completing PE programmes. Level 3 in personal training was being offered imminently. One prisoner was being well supported on a level 4 course in sports fitness and management through the Open University. Sports leader awards were popular and provided prisoners with particularly good personal, social and employability skills. A range of additional programmes, such as football and basketball leadership awards were offered during the year and externally assessed. Achievements on courses were high and the majority who started successfully completed.
- 3.27 Prisoners received a thorough introduction to PE during their first week in the prison. Healthy living and the importance of exercise were very well promoted through the variety of PE courses, courses in health education, posters and remedial PE, for example. Appropriately trained prisoner orderlies provided good health and well-being support as well as basic PE

instruction. A wide range of recreational PE was available each week and included sessions in bokwa, zumba, body balance and spinning.

- 3.28 PE staff gave prisoners referred by health care and considered unsuitable to participate in normal physical activities good remedial support. Several staff were qualified to provide biomechanical screening, which was used to diagnose and treat injuries. Appropriate PE kit and trainers were available for prisoners who needed them although most prisoners wore their own.

Section 4: Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

Planning for a prisoner's release or transfer starts on their arrival to the prison. Resettlement underpins the work of the whole prison, supported by strategic partnerships in the community and informed by assessment of prisoner risk and need. Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.

- 4.1 Despite the resettlement policy being out of date and there being no formal meeting structure to manage resettlement and sentence management, overall, resettlement and offender management was broadly appropriate. Greater strategic development and integration of services however was needed.
- 4.2 The prison had in November 2012 updated its service standards document for resettlement services, which outlined, broadly, the key principles and objectives of the work it undertook. The actual policy, however, had not been updated since 2008 and, while this document quite comprehensively outlined the resettlement function, it was now out of date. There was no strategy in place, outlining developments or objectives for the various services, even though it was apparent from discussions with managers that resettlement was continually developing and responding to needs. For example, various accredited offending behaviour programmes had been introduced in the previous 12 months (see section on attitudes, thinking and behaviour).
- 4.3 Some strategic links had been developed with the Jersey community and some agencies were offering 'through the gate' support, even though these were limited. Links, however, with the Jersey probation service were good and while prisoners released into the community were not subject to any form of statutory supervision, integrated public protection arrangements under the Jersey multi-agency public protection arrangements (J-MAPPA) had been established.
- 4.4 There was no resettlement strategic managers' meeting, although the programme managers' meeting, focusing primarily on the development and delivery of accredited programmes, did include both the head of programmes and psychology and the head of the sentence management unit. There was evidence that discussions extended beyond programmes. Nevertheless, there was no regular forum incorporating representatives from all departments and resettlement service providers. Although a number of these providers offered reasonable services, there was some evidence that they did so in isolation of one another (see section on reintegration planning).
- 4.5 Despite some of these limitations, resettlement and sentence management work was appropriate and all but a small number of prisoners (those on remand or subject to sentences of less than six months, four months for young adults) had their resettlement and offending behaviour needs assessed and, broadly, met at the point of release.

Recommendations

- 4.6 The prison should develop a clear and up-to-date resettlement policy that outlines the function and strategic direction of the service.

- 4.7 Progress against identified resettlement developments and objectives should be reviewed and monitored by a multidisciplinary resettlement forum which should, as far as possible, incorporate the Jersey community, specifically in regard to the resettlement of prisoners post-release.

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.8 All prisoners serving more than 12 months were subject to sentence planning and, while the system worked reasonably well, there was a need to focus more on issues of risk. Although most prisoners said they had a sentence plan, it remained unclear who was responsible for driving sentence plans forward. All prisoners were allocated a probation officer and both probation officers and psychologists undertook some one-to-one work. Public protection arrangements were generally sound and while release on temporary licence (ROTL) provision was potentially available for all prisoners, only those from Jersey were able to work in the community prior to release.
- 4.9 All prisoners serving over six months (four months for young adults) were subject to assessment and sentence planning, which was undertaken by two sentence management officers, both of whom worked full time. Although there was no formal assessment process, information from sentence enquiry reports and other sources, including assessments of reoffending risks undertaken by probation staff, were used to inform judgements. Departments from across the establishments were also asked to make written contributions. Once completed, prisoners were invited to formal sentence plan meetings, which included psychology and probation staff, along with personal officers and the sentence management officer responsible for the plan. Arrangements were generally well organised and in our survey 81% of prisoners, compared with only 39% in comparator prisons, said they had a sentence plan.
- 4.10 Although a pro-forma was used to construct reports to ensure all key areas were covered, some plans we reviewed during the inspection were formulaic and did not focus sufficiently on the prisoners' individual needs. Too many plans also lacked attention to risk of harm and reoffending factors. Although in some cases specific pieces of work were identified for given departments to take forward, it was unclear whose responsibility it was to drive the overall plan and encourage and support prisoners to achieve identified objectives. This was not a specific role for sentence management officers and some staff suggested that personal officers were responsible, but the knowledge held by those officers we spoke to during the inspection varied considerably and most were not aware of what targets had actually been set. Despite this, in our survey, 55% of prisoners said that a named personal officer was working with them to achieve sentence plan targets.
- 4.11 There was no structured custody planning for those on remand (39 at the time of the inspection) or serving sentences of less than six months (four at the time of the inspection). The prison was planning to introduce a passport model to assess the needs of these prisoners against each resettlement pathway; however, this had yet to be implemented. These prisoners

were, nevertheless, able to access the bi-monthly resettlement marketplace meeting (see section on reintegration planning).

- 4.12 All prisoners, regardless of whether they were likely to return to Jersey, were allocated to one of three probation officers. One was based in the prison, while the other two were based in the community and came in to see prisoners prior to their release. While much of this work focused on welfare issues, there was also some focus on addressing offending behaviour and evidence of structured one-to-one work in this area. The psychology department also offered some individually focused offending behaviour work.
- 4.13 All women were interviewed during induction and asked specifically about any issues relating to sexual abuse, domestic violence or involvement in the sex industry. Where appropriate, support was provided by the psychology team on an individual basis. Referrals could also be made to the clinical psychology team based in the community if follow up on release was required.
- 4.14 Assessments for ROTL were generally appropriate and, subject to security and general assessment, in principle was available for all prisoners across the establishment. However, there were considerable restrictions particularly affecting foreign nationals or those who were not entitled to stay in Jersey after their release. All prisoners, regardless of their nationality or Jersey status, could apply for community visits as long as they were to meet with a partner or parent and were restricted to within Jersey itself. Twenty-three such visits had taken place throughout 2012, including three women – a slightly higher number relative to their proportion of the prison population.
- 4.15 Prisoners from the island could also undertake voluntary work and, following that, paid employment under the scheme, as well as receive home leave. Most such Jersey residents took this opportunity, and at the time of the inspection, four prisoners were working outside the prison and were accommodated on G wing. These prisoners were able, potentially, to be released on home detention curfew (HDC) – 15 HDC licences had been granted throughout 2012, including two to women, which again was a higher number relative to their proportion of the population.

Recommendations

- 4.16 Sentence plans should focus specifically on issues relating to risk of harm and risk of reoffending.
- 4.17 The prison should clearly identify who is responsible for managing sentence plans and for working with prisoners to ensure targets are achieved.
- 4.18 Custody planning should be introduced for prisoners on remand or serving sentences of less than six months (four months for young adults).
- 4.19 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) should be extended to offer working out provision, at least on a voluntary basis, to all prisoners, subject to a risk assessment.

Public protection

- 4.20 Public protection arrangements were generally good and considerably better than those in place at our last inspection. Two structures to manage risk were available; the J-MAPPA board, which was managed in the community via the police and probation services, and the

internal multi-agency risk assessment management meeting (MARAMM). All prisoners received a risk assessment based primarily on the nature of their offence, which also determined which structure was appropriate. Both processes appeared comprehensive and MARAMM meetings were appropriately frequent and focused.

Categorisation

- 4.21 La Moye was the only prison in Jersey and as a consequence there was no formal categorisation process with all those held subject to the same level of security. The exception to this had been when a category A prisoner had been held during their trial and subsequent appeal process prior to being returned to the England and Wales Prison Service. During their time in Jersey they had been held on a separate wing.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.22 The prison did not hold indeterminate sentenced prisoners. When a prisoner received an indeterminate sentence they had invariably been sent to England, at the expense of the Jersey authorities. At the time of the inspection one prisoner was subject to these arrangements.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.23 Access to reintegration services was reasonable and all prisoners could attend the resettlement 'marketplace', but there was no needs analysis to establish if the right services were being offered and contacts were not followed up. Although nearly all prisoners had accommodation on release, structured support for this was limited, as was support for prisoners to find employment. Visiting facilities and family visits were limited but likely to improve with planned new arrangements. The range of offending behaviour programmes was generally good.

- 4.24 The prison released an average of about 19 prisoners a month. A review meeting for those subject to sentence planning was held approximately one month prior to release. Once every two months a resettlement 'marketplace' meeting was held where prisoners could meet service providers offering support for their release. Approximately 20 prisoners attended this meeting on each occasion. Prisoners who were not due to be released could also access the marketplace meeting if they needed help or advice from agencies such as the Citizens Advice Bureau.

- 4.25 The Jersey Probation Service offered voluntary aftercare support to those prisoners released to Jersey itself. In total around 40% of all prisoners, including those subject to HDC, had post release contact with approximately half taking up voluntary support (21% throughout 2012). For some prisoners, including those accessing supported housing, this support could be for as long as two years. Those subject to JMAPP were also monitored upon release, irrespective of whether they took up voluntary aftercare.

Recommendation

- 4.26 The prison should undertake a needs assessment of prisoners' resettlement requirements and ensure that such provision is available prior to release.

Accommodation

- 4.27 Although the prison's own figures indicated that only one person had left the prison without accommodation in the previous year, it was not clear how appropriate or sustainable the accommodation was. Two agencies attended the marketplace meeting and worked with prisoners to offer accommodation support – the Shelter Trust and the Freedom for Life Ministries. The Shelter Trust only offered hostel accommodation and rarely received new referrals from the prison. The Freedom for Life Ministries worked with around 25 prisoners at any time prior to their release and more after release. It was disappointing, however, that the service was not funded by either the prison or the councils of Jersey and was dependent on donations; as a result, the support could not necessarily be relied on in the long term.
- 4.28 The marketplace meeting only benefited those returning to live in Jersey and there was little support for those returning to England or elsewhere. On release these prisoners were given enough money to stay in bed and breakfast accommodation for a week or get a flight to the UK. Five years' residency in Jersey, prior to custody, was required to qualify for income support.

Recommendation

- 4.29 The prison should ensure that accommodation advice and support is consistently available to prisoners, including those returning to the UK where possible.

Education, training and employment

- 4.30 All prisoners received appropriate careers advice and guidance from well qualified staff from the resettlement unit and Workwise, the local employment service. There was insufficient employer engagement. However, the virtual learning environment and intranet were in the process of being further developed to include a job search facility. Prisoners were able to prepare CVs and supporting letters and place them on the intranet for easy access. There were insufficient links between the resettlement and learning and skills departments. Prisoners gained good employability skills in many areas and those on vocational training programmes developed good practical skills. No data was available to show what proportion of those released had entered into employment, education or training (see section on education and vocational achievements).

Recommendations

- 4.31 The prison should develop further links with employers, training providers and colleges to increase the prospects of prisoners entering into employment, education or training when they leave.
- 4.32 The prison should improve the working links between the learning and skills and resettlement departments so that it is able to offer prisoners a better, more coordinated service to help them move into employment, training and education on release.

Health care

- 4.33 Timely pre-release health assessments were offered to all prisoners. Those on medication were given take home medication and, subject to prisoners' agreement, the prison communicated with their GP. Harm minimisation packs were offered, including barrier protection. There was no palliative care or end of life care policy in place, although one was being considered when we visited.

Housekeeping point

- 4.34 There should be a palliative care and end of life policy.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.35 Information sharing between the police and health services on prescribing regimes and risk assessments undertaken in custody was good. Arrangements with the community drug and alcohol service to ensure treatment continued once a prisoner was released had become less effective. Prisoners were still referred to the service, but the community nurse no longer visited the prison to undertake pre-release work, and the director rarely attended the prison's drug strategy committee. The establishment was keen to strengthen links again and the governor, head of health care and the head of interventions had met with directors of the community drug and alcohol service and mental health services to address better joint working.
- 4.36 The care of clients in contact with both health and drug and alcohol services was not sufficiently well coordinated and we could find no evidence of pre-release work or of release plans for prisoners with drug and/or alcohol problems since case files were not made available (see section on substance misuse).

Recommendation

- 4.37 **Joint work between prison-based health and drug and alcohol services should be improved and links with community providers strengthened to ensure prisoners have continued treatment in the community and post-release support.**

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.38 The prison was not aware of prisoners' finance, benefit and debt needs, although the range of provision appeared broadly appropriate. The Citizens Advice Bureau attended bi-monthly marketplace meetings and offered advice and guidance about a range of issues, including debt management, and an average of seven prisoners used the service at each meeting. A community bank also attended the marketplace and offered advice regarding opening accounts prior to release, as well as information on potential savings schemes that could be set up during prisoners' sentences. The education department offered an Open College Network accredited personal finance and budget management course at levels 1 and 2.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.39 A number of different departments across the prison were involved in work to support and maintain family links, but there was no clear coordination and some aspects operated in

isolation. Storybook reading was available for all prisoners via the education department and a range of individual support was provided by the chaplaincy. There were no parenting courses, although some broad plans were in place to develop these in line with family visits.

- 4.40 There was currently no visitors' centre, only a small waiting room, and the visits hall itself was quite limited. There was no play area for children and no drink or snack facilities. Access, however, was reasonable and, depending on their incentives and earned privileges level, prisoners could receive up to two 45-minute visits a week if they were sentenced and three if they were on remand. Overseas visitors could combine visits to extend the available time, although occasions when this was possible were limited. Nevertheless, in our survey, 57% of prisoners compared with 35% in comparator prisons said that staff had supported them to maintain contact with their family and/or friends, and 48% (36% in comparator prisons) said it was easy or very easy for their visitors to get to the prison.
- 4.41 An impressive new facility had been built and was about to be opened; this could improve facilities for visitors considerably. The visits room was large, bright and airy and would offer a more conducive environment for up to 23 prisoners at any given time along with a smaller visits facility. We were encouraged that the new visits building also provided extended family visits opportunities, especially given the female population, and it was hoped that these would be introduced in the near future. Prisoners currently wore a coloured sash during visits and it was likely that this would continue in the new facility. This arrangement appeared unnecessary.

Recommendations

- 4.42 **The prison should extend the range of provision available to support the children and families of prisoners, which should include family visits and parenting courses.**
- 4.43 **Prisoners should not have to wear coloured sashes or bibs during visits.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.44 In the 12 months prior to the inspection, the prison had introduced two alcohol-related courses: Addressing Substance Related Offending – Secure (ASRO-S) and the Jersey alcohol-related violence intervention strategy (JARVIS). The programmes had been introduced on the basis of a general assessment of offending behaviour needs by the psychology department and appeared to be broadly appropriate. The prison expected to introduce the thinking skills programme (TSP) later in the year which would potentially be available for the whole population, although there was already a long waiting list for assessment of almost half the population.
- 4.45 Although JARVIS was specifically designed for young men with patterns of alcohol related violence, women were able to access the ASRO-S programme and five women, representing all those who met the criteria, completed the course between March and December 2012.
- 4.46 Prisoners not directly served by these programmes were those with a history of domestic violence and those convicted of sexual offences. Some individual work was undertaken by both probation and psychology staff to address the issues of both groups, but there was no clear strategic approach or formal agreement for joint working with the island's probation service. As there was no post-release community licence beyond HDC, the only level of contact post- custody was on a voluntary basis, with only approximately 20% of those released

in Jersey actually taking this up. Although J-MAPPA arrangements were robust, this did not allow for the structured treatment of sex offenders on release.

Recommendation

- 4.47 The prison and Jersey probation service should develop a strategy to ensure the coordinated and effective provision of treatment for sex offenders during their sentence.

Additional resettlement services

- 4.48 There were no other resettlement services.

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.

Main recommendations

To the governor

-
- 5.1 The States of Jersey should make alternative arrangements for holding children in custody. (HP52)
 - 5.2 The segregation unit should be decommissioned or completely refurbished and the quiet cell should be taken out of use permanently. (HP53)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

-
- 5.3 Reception holding rooms should be equipped with material to keep prisoners occupied and prisoners should remain in reception for the shortest possible time. (1.8)
 - 5.4 Format, delivery and record keeping for the induction programme should be improved and when not actively involved in induction prisoners should be unlocked. (1.9)

Bullying and violence reduction

-
- 5.5 Formal monitoring arrangements for perpetrators of antisocial behaviour should be used when investigations recommend this and targets should be tailored to the individual. (1.16)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

-
- 5.6 Quality assurance and governance should be in place to make sure RCA documents are being used appropriately to ensure good care for prisoners at risk. (1.26)
 - 5.7 Access to Listeners and Samaritans should be improved. (1.27)

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

-
- 5.8 The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.33)

Security

-
- 5.9 Security arrangements should be proportionate and based on risk assessments. (1.40)

- 5.10 Prisoners should only be strip-searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion. Women should only be strip-searched in exceptional circumstances. (1.41)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.11 Basic level prisoners should be set individual targets, given timely reviews and have access to a consistent regime. (1.47)
- 5.12 There should be adequate managerial oversight of the IEP scheme. (1.48)

Discipline

- 5.13 Prisoners should be able to access legal advice. (1.52)
- 5.14 The prison should implement adjudication standardisation meetings, published tariffs and quality assurance procedures. (1.53)
- 5.15 Governance of use of force, including special accommodation, strip-clothing and planned interventions, should be improved. (1.60)
- 5.16 Prisoners supported on RCA documents should only be located in the CCU in exceptional circumstances. (1.67)
- 5.17 Governance arrangements for the use of segregation, including GOOD, the regime and staffing should be improved. (1.68)

Substance misuse

- 5.18 A GP with a special interest in the management of substance misuse should be engaged to develop clinical protocols for opiate substitute treatment, including stabilisation, detoxification and maintenance prescribing regimes, which are in line with best practice. (1.78)
- 5.19 Comprehensive assessments, care plans and reviews that demonstrate patient involvement should be developed. (1.79)
- 5.20 A drug and alcohol needs analysis should be undertaken. (1.80)

Residential units

- 5.21 Exercise yards on K and L wings should be properly paved and finished, and seating and recreational equipment should be provided. (2.6)
- 5.22 There should be sufficient privacy screening for all communal showers and J wing in-cell toilets. (2.7)

Equality and diversity

- 5.23 The prison should implement an equality and diversity strategy with solid structures and including monitoring, impact assessments and regular communication with prisoners from all protected characteristics. (2.20)

- 5.24 The prison should implement a separate foreign national strategy that ensures the needs of all foreign national prisoners are regularly met. (2.28)
- 5.25 The prison should consider integrating young adult prisoners with adult prisoners across the establishment. (2.29)
- 5.26 The prison should work with women prisoners to better understand their needs and formulate a regime that meets these needs. (2.30)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.27 The prison should ensure that the faith needs of Muslim prisoners are met. (2.35)

Complaints

- 5.28 Confidential complaint forms should only be opened by an appropriate manager. (2.41)
- 5.29 Investigations into staff-related issues should always be thoroughly investigated. (2.42)

Legal rights

- 5.30 Adequate legal services provision should be introduced. (2.47)

Health services

- 5.31 There should be a health needs analysis. (2.60)
- 5.32 There should be a formal governance arrangement between the prison's health services and the States of Jersey health and social care department. (2.61)
- 5.33 Clinical records should be stored confidentially and securely. (2.62)
- 5.34 The health centre should be extended. (2.63)
- 5.35 The complaints system should preserve medical confidentiality. (2.64)
- 5.36 Barrier protection should be available to all prisoners who require it. (2.65)
- 5.37 The pharmacist should be supported to develop pharmacy-led clinics and medicine use reviews for the prison population. (2.75)
- 5.38 Dispensing the medication of one prisoner to another is inappropriate and should stop immediately. (2.76)
- 5.39 The administration of the contents of pregabalin and gabapentin capsules in water should be reviewed to ensure that it is safe, and robust written procedures put in place. (2.77)
- 5.40 The medicines trolleys should be secured to the wall, kept locked when not in use, and their transportation through prisoner areas should cease to reduce security risks. (2.78)

- 5.41 It is inappropriate for the laundry room to be used for medicines administration on H wing; alternative arrangements should be made. (2.79)
- 5.42 The health needs analysis should include an assessment of the requirement for dental services and treatments at the prison. (2.86)
- 5.43 The dental surgery should be enlarged and the decontamination facilities should be in a separate room. (2.87)
- 5.44 The segregation unit should not be used to provide ongoing care for patients with complex and serious mental health problems. (2.89)
- 5.45 The transfer of patients to external mental health services should be expedited and occur within agreed good practice transfer guidelines timescales. (2.90)

Purchases

- 5.46 There should be a wider range of goods for female prisoners and religious items should be available. (2.102)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.47 Aspects of quality assurance, including self-assessment, management meetings and observations of teaching and learning, should be further improved. (3.9)
- 5.48 The prison should improve the collection, analysis and use of learning and skills data to better inform management decisions. (3.10)
- 5.49 The prison should continue to ensure that women and young adults have access to a full range of appropriate purposeful activities. (3.14)
- 5.50 The prison should ensure that catering qualifications are offered at a higher level to provide learners with better employment prospects on release. (3.15)
- 5.51 The prison should collect and use data regarding the proportion of prisoners who progress into employment or education and training on release to inform the variety of provision offered. (3.21)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.52 The prison should develop a clear and up-to-date resettlement policy that outlines the function and strategic direction of the service. (4.6)
- 5.53 Progress against identified resettlement developments and objectives should be reviewed and monitored by a multidisciplinary resettlement forum which should, as far as possible, incorporate the Jersey community, specifically in regard to the resettlement of prisoners post-release. (4.7)

Offender management and planning

- 5.54 Sentence plans should focus specifically on issues relating to risk of harm and risk of reoffending. (4.16)
- 5.55 The prison should clearly identify who is responsible for managing sentence plans and for working with prisoners to ensure targets are achieved. (4.17)
- 5.56 Custody planning should be introduced for prisoners on remand or serving sentences of less than six months (four months for young adults). (4.18)
- 5.57 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) should be extended to offer working out provision, at least on a voluntary basis, to all prisoners, subject to a risk assessment. (4.19)

Reintegration planning

- 5.58 The prison should undertake a needs assessment of prisoners' resettlement requirements and ensure that such provision is available prior to release. (4.26)
- 5.59 The prison should ensure that accommodation advice and support is consistently available to prisoners, including those returning to the UK where possible. (4.29)
- 5.60 The prison should develop further links with employers, training providers and colleges to increase the prospects of prisoners entering into employment, education or training when they leave. (4.31)
- 5.61 The prison should improve the working links between the learning and skills and resettlement departments so that it is able to offer prisoners a better, more coordinated service to help them move into employment, training and education on release. (4.32)
- 5.62 Joint work between prison-based health and drug and alcohol services should be improved and links with community providers strengthened to ensure prisoners have continued treatment in the community and post-release support. (4.37)
- 5.63 The prison should extend the range of provision available to support the children and families of prisoners, which should include family visits and parenting courses. (4.42)
- 5.64 Prisoners should not have to wear coloured sashes or bibs during visits. (4.43)
- 5.65 The prison and Jersey probation service should develop a strategy to ensure the coordinated and effective provision of treatment for sex offenders during their sentence. (4.47)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

- 5.66 Listeners should be in reception when new arrivals are received. (1.10)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.67 Death in custody action plans should be reviewed regularly. (1.28)

Discipline

- 5.68 Association should only be curtailed for those placed on report in exceptional circumstances. (1.54)
- 5.69 Adjudications should be held in a suitable room. (1.55)
- 5.70 Records of adjudications should reflect sufficient investigation. (1.56)

Substance misuse

- 5.71 The drug and alcohol service should provide prisoners with good quality drug awareness and harm reduction information. (1.81)
- 5.72 All staff delivering drug and alcohol services should be subject to case management reviews and supervision to ensure accountability and professional standards. (1.82)

Residential units

- 5.73 Application forms should be freely available on all wings. (2.8)
- 5.74 The plans to decommission G wing should be accelerated. (2.9)

Complaints

- 5.75 Replies to complaints should address prisoners by their preferred name and should always be polite. (2.43)

Health services

- 5.76 Information leaflets on health care should be accessible to prisoners with reading difficulties. (2.66)
- 5.77 Care should be taken to make full and complete records of the administration of medicines. (2.80)
- 5.78 The list of medicines available as over-the-counter remedies should be reviewed by the medicines and therapeutics committee to ensure it complies with the current legislation. (2.81)
- 5.79 A prison formulary that more accurately reflects the prison health needs analysis and prisoner population needs should be put in place. (2.82)
- 5.80 The introduction of PGDs should be considered to enable nursing staff to supply more potent medication and to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. A copy of the original

signed PGDs should be available in the pharmacy, which should be read and signed by all relevant staff. (2.83)

Catering

- 5.81 Wing servery workers should be correctly dressed. (2.95)
- 5.82 Printed menus for prisoners should identify religious options. (2.96)
- 5.83 The evening meal should not be served before 5pm. (2.97)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.84 Staff should be trained to ensure electronic whiteboards are used more effectively in lessons. (3.19)
- 5.85 The prison should consider employing prisoners as library orderlies and they should have the opportunity to complete an appropriate vocational qualification. (3.23)

Reintegration planning

- 5.86 There should be a palliative care and end of life policy. (4.34)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief Inspector
Kieron Taylor	Team leader
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Kevin Parkinson	Inspector
Andy Lund	Inspector
Rachel Murray	Researcher
Amy Radford	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Paul Tarbuck	Health services inspector
Simon Denton	Pharmacist
Neil Edwards	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Status	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	5	114	77.3
Recall	0	0	0
Convicted unsentenced	0	0	0
Remand	1	34	22.7
Civil prisoners	0	0	0
Detainees	0	0	0
Total	6	148	100

Sentence	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	1	36	24
Less than 6 months	0	4	2.6
6 months to less than 12 months	0	3	1.9
12 months to less than 2 years	2	12	9.1
2 years to less than 4 years	2	31	21.9
4 years to less than 10 years	1	52	34
10 years and over (not life)	0	10	6.5
ISPP	0	0	0
Life	0	0	0
Total	6	148	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age	Not available	
Under 21 years		
21 years to 29 years		
30 years to 39 years		
40 years to 49 years		
50 years to 59 years		
60 years to 69 years		
70 plus years		
Please state maximum age		
Total		

Nationality	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	Not available		
Foreign nationals			
Total			

Security category	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced			
Uncategorised sentenced			
Cat A			
Cat B	6	134	90.9
Cat C	0	4	2.6
Cat D	0	10	6.5
Other			
Total	6	148	100

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	3	95	63.6
Irish			
Other white	3	39	27.3
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean			
White and black African			
White and Asian			
Other mixed			
Asian or Asian British		9	5.9
Indian			
Pakistani			
Bangladeshi			
Other Asian			
Black or black British			
Caribbean			
African			
Other black		5	3.2
Chinese or other ethnic group			
Chinese			
Arab			
Other ethnic group			
Not stated			
Total	6	148	100

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	2	1.3
Church of England	0	27	18
Roman Catholic	1	43	28.6
Other Christian denominations	0	8	5.2
Muslim	0	9	5.8
Sikh	0	0	0
Hindu	0	1	0.6
Buddhist	0	1	0.6
Jewish	0	1	0.6
Other	0	7	4.2
No religion	5	49	35.1
Total	6	148	100

Other demographics	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Gypsy/Romany/Traveller	Not available		
Total			

Other demographics	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)	Not available		
Total			

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0	4	3.5
1 month to 3 months	0	0	5	4.4
3 months to 6 months	2	40	10	8.8
6 months to 1 year	3	60	24	21.1
1 year to 2 years	0	0	35	30.7
2 years to 4 years	0	0	27	23.7
4 years or more	0	0	9	7.9
Total	5	100	114	100.1

Sentenced prisoners only

	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	Not available		
Public protection cases			
Total			

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	1	100	6	17.6
1 month to 3 months	0	0	11	32.5
3 months to 6 months	0	0	13	38.2
6 months to 1 year	0	0	3	8.8
1 year to 2 years	0	0	0	0
2 years to 4 years	0	0	1	2.9
4 years or more				
Total	1	100	34	100

Main offence	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person		7	20
Sexual offences		4	11.4
Burglary			
Robbery			
Theft and handling			
Fraud and forgery			
Drugs offences		11	31.4
Other offences	1	12	37.2
Civil offences			
Offence not recorded/holding warrant			
Total	1	34	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 10 January 2013 the prisoner population at HMP La Moye was 160; 151 prisoners were male and nine were female. Everyone was offered a survey. Overall, this represented 100% of the prisoner population.

Selecting the sample

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

No female respondents refused to complete a questionnaire.

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. No prisoners were interviewed.

Methodology

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

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

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

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

Response rates

In total, 120 male respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 80% of the prison population. The response rate was 80%. In addition to the eight respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, 13 questionnaires were not returned and 10 were returned blank.

All female respondents completed and returned their questionnaire.

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 about which respondents are included in the filtered questions. Otherwise, percentages provided refer to the entire sample. All missing responses are excluded from the analysis.

Due to the size of the female population it was not possible to conduct any additional analyses.

The following analyses have been conducted for the male population:

- The current survey responses in 2013 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 36 local prisons since April 2007.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between those who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between those who were held on the vulnerable prisoner unit (J wing) and those held on all other wings (G, K and L wings).

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

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

Summary

In addition, a summary of the survey results is attached. This shows a breakdown of responses for each question 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 for certain responses within the summary, for example 'not sentenced' options across questions, may differ slightly. This is due to different response rates across questions, meaning that the percentages have been calculated out of different totals (all missing data are excluded). The actual numbers will match up as the data are cleaned to be consistent.

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

Survey summary (men)

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>	4 (3%)	
	<i>21 - 29</i>	30 (25%)	
	<i>30 - 39</i>	35 (30%)	
	<i>40 - 49</i>	29 (25%)	
	<i>50 - 59</i>	10 (8%)	
	<i>60 - 69</i>	8 (7%)	
	<i>70 and over</i>	2 (2%)	
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>	87 (73%)	
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	1 (1%)	
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	11 (9%)	
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	20 (17%)	
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	0 (0%)	
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Not sentenced	31 (26%)	
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	2 (2%)	
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	5 (4%)	
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	13 (11%)	
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	22 (19%)	
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	37 (31%)	
	<i>10 years or more</i>	8 (7%)	
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	0 (0%)	
	<i>Life</i>	0 (0%)	
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)		
	<i>Yes</i>	24 (21%)	
	<i>No</i>	93 (79%)	
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	117 (99%)	
	<i>No</i>	1 (1%)	
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	118 (99%)	
	<i>No</i>	1 (1%)	
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/Scottish/ Northern Irish)...</i>	80 (68%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese.</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	3 (3%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - other</i>	20 (17%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	4 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 1 (1%)

<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	3 (3%)	<i>Arab</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	6 (5%)		

Q1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?

Yes.....	0 (0%)
No.....	115 (100%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

<i>None</i>	34 (29%)	<i>Hindu</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Church of England</i>	27 (23%)	<i>Jewish</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Catholic</i>	34 (29%)	<i>Muslim</i>	6 (5%)
<i>Protestant</i>	7 (6%)	<i>Sikh</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	7 (6%)	<i>Other</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	0 (0%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

<i>Heterosexual/straight</i>	114 (96%)
<i>Homosexual/gay</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	4 (3%)

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

Yes.....	15 (13%)
No.....	104 (87%)

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

Yes.....	6 (5%)
No.....	113 (95%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes.....	46 (39%)
No.....	73 (61%)

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

Yes.....	48 (41%)
No.....	70 (59%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

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

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	109 (92%)
<i>2 hours or longer</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (8%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	109 (92%)
Yes.....	2 (2%)
No.....	2 (2%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (5%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	109 (91%)
---	-----------

Yes.....	2 (2%)
No.....	5 (4%)
Don't remember	4 (3%)

Q2.4 On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?

Yes.....	63 (53%)
No.....	44 (37%)
Don't remember	11 (9%)

Q2.5 On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?

Yes.....	103 (87%)
No.....	12 (10%)
Don't remember	4 (3%)

Q2.6 On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?

Very well.....	40 (33%)
Well.....	45 (38%)
Neither.....	30 (25%)
Badly.....	1 (1%)
Very badly	1 (1%)
Don't remember	3 (3%)

Q2.7 Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Yes, someone told me	93 (81%)
Yes, I received written information.....	7 (6%)
No, I was not told anything.....	9 (8%)
Don't remember	8 (7%)

Q2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?

Yes.....	59 (50%)
No.....	49 (41%)
Don't remember	11 (9%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1 How long were you in reception?

Less than 2 hours.....	85 (71%)
2 hours or longer.....	31 (26%)
Don't remember	4 (3%)

Q3.2 When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?

Yes.....	101 (85%)
No	13 (11%)
Don't remember	5 (4%)

Q3.3 Overall, how were you treated in reception?

Very well.....	45 (38%)
Well.....	51 (43%)
Neither.....	16 (13%)
Badly.....	6 (5%)
Very badly.....	0 (0%)
Don't remember	1 (1%)

- Q3.4 Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | | | |
|---|----------|--|----------|
| <i>Loss of property</i> | 13 (11%) | <i>Physical health</i> | 20 (17%) |
| <i>Housing problems</i> | 11 (9%) | <i>Mental health</i> | 14 (12%) |
| <i>Contacting employers</i> | 5 (4%) | <i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i> | 6 (5%) |
| <i>Contacting family</i> | 19 (16%) | <i>Getting phone numbers</i> | 26 (22%) |
| <i>Childcare</i> | 6 (5%) | <i>Other</i> | 6 (5%) |
| <i>Money worries</i> | 28 (24%) | Did not have any problems | 54 (45%) |
| <i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i> | 17 (14%) | | |
- Q3.5 Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| Yes | 38 (32%) |
| No..... | 27 (23%) |
| Did not have any problems | 54 (45%) |
- Q3.6 When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| <i>Tobacco</i> | 80 (67%) |
| <i>A shower</i> | 73 (61%) |
| <i>A free telephone call</i> | 24 (20%) |
| <i>Something to eat</i> | 75 (63%) |
| <i>PIN phone credit</i> | 81 (68%) |
| <i>Toiletries/basic items</i> | 91 (76%) |
| Did not receive anything | 6 (5%) |
- Q3.7 When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| <i>Chaplain</i> | 54 (47%) |
| <i>Someone from health services</i> | 88 (76%) |
| <i>A Listener/Samaritans</i> | 44 (38%) |
| <i>Prison shop/canteen</i> | 47 (41%) |
| Did not have access to any of these | 11 (9%) |
- Q3.8 When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| <i>What was going to happen to you</i> | 68 (59%) |
| <i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i> | 45 (39%) |
| <i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i> | 65 (56%) |
| <i>Your entitlement to visits</i> | 68 (59%) |
| <i>Health services</i> | 73 (63%) |
| <i>Chaplaincy</i> | 54 (47%) |
| Not offered any information | 17 (15%) |
- Q3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?**
- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Yes | 100 (85%) |
| No..... | 8 (7%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 10 (8%) |
- Q3.10 How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?**
- | | |
|---|----------|
| Have not been on an induction course | 46 (39%) |
| <i>Within the first week</i> | 31 (26%) |
| <i>More than a week</i> | 21 (18%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 20 (17%) |

Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	46 (41%)
	Yes	35 (31%)
	No.....	9 (8%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	22 (20%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	34 (29%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	18 (15%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	43 (36%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	24 (20%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to:						
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>N/A</i>
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	33 (28%)	52 (44%)	11 (9%)	9 (8%)	7 (6%)	6 (5%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	32 (29%)	49 (45%)	11 (10%)	6 (5%)	2 (2%)	10 (9%)
	<i>Get bail information?</i>	14 (14%)	29 (28%)	10 (10%)	13 (13%)	9 (9%)	27 (26%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?						
	<i>Not had any letters</i>						6 (5%)
	Yes						54 (46%)
	No.....						58 (49%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?						
	Yes.....						61 (51%)
	No.....						11 (9%)
	<i>Don't know</i>						48 (40%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:						
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>			
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	111 (93%)	8 (7%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	117 (98%)	3 (3%)	0 (0%)			
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	98 (82%)	21 (18%)	0 (0%)			
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	107 (89%)	12 (10%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	63 (53%)	34 (29%)	21 (18%)			
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	93 (78%)	25 (21%)	2 (2%)			
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	70 (59%)	20 (17%)	28 (24%)			
Q4.5	What is the food like here?						
	<i>Very good</i>						9 (8%)
	<i>Good</i>						53 (44%)

	Neither.....	33 (28%)
	Bad.....	14 (12%)
	Very bad.....	11 (9%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/don't know</i>	1 (1%)
	Yes.....	89 (75%)
	No.....	29 (24%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	
	Yes.....	81 (68%)
	No.....	12 (10%)
	Don't know.....	27 (23%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes.....	66 (56%)
	No.....	10 (8%)
	Don't know/N/A.....	42 (36%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes.....	70 (59%)
	No.....	11 (9%)
	Don't know/N/A.....	37 (31%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	23 (19%)
	Very easy.....	32 (27%)
	Easy.....	38 (32%)
	Neither.....	4 (3%)
	Difficult.....	2 (2%)
	Very difficult.....	6 (5%)
	Don't know.....	14 (12%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?			
	Yes.....	107 (91%)		
	No.....	5 (4%)		
	Don't know.....	5 (4%)		
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications:			
	<i>(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	5 (4%)	80 (70%)	30 (26%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	5 (5%)	76 (75%)	20 (20%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes.....	68 (60%)		
	No.....	17 (15%)		
	Don't know.....	28 (25%)		

Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints: (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	52 (47%)	31 (28%)	28 (25%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	52 (49%)	33 (31%)	21 (20%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes.....			17 (15%)
	No.....			93 (85%)
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?			
	Don't know who they are			69 (60%)
	Very easy.....			8 (7%)
	Easy.....			11 (10%)
	Neither.....			7 (6%)
	Difficult.....			14 (12%)
	Very difficult.....			6 (5%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)			
	Don't know what the IEP scheme is			10 (9%)
	Yes.....			76 (66%)
	No.....			18 (16%)
	Don't know.....			11 (10%)
Q6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)			
	Don't know what the IEP scheme is			10 (9%)
	Yes.....			43 (38%)
	No.....			47 (41%)
	Don't know.....			14 (12%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?			
	Yes.....			4 (3%)
	No.....			111 (97%)
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?			
	I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months			92 (80%)
	Very well.....			4 (3%)
	Well.....			14 (12%)
	Neither.....			1 (1%)
	Badly.....			3 (3%)
	Very badly.....			1 (1%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?			
	Yes.....			110 (94%)
	No.....			7 (6%)

Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes.....	108 (92%)
	No.....	9 (8%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes.....	59 (51%)
	No.....	57 (49%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	Do not go on association	8 (7%)
	Never.....	3 (3%)
	Rarely.....	12 (10%)
	Some of the time.....	45 (39%)
	Most of the time.....	30 (26%)
	All of the time.....	18 (16%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I have not met him/her	10 (8%)
	In the first week.....	52 (44%)
	More than a week.....	44 (37%)
	Don't remember.....	13 (11%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her	10 (9%)
	Very helpful.....	38 (34%)
	Helpful.....	34 (30%)
	Neither.....	16 (14%)
	Not very helpful.....	7 (6%)
	Not at all helpful.....	8 (7%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes.....	21 (18%)
	No.....	97 (82%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes.....	4 (3%)
	No.....	111 (97%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	97 (84%)
	Everywhere.....	2 (2%)
	Segregation unit.....	2 (2%)
	Association areas.....	7 (6%)
	Reception area.....	0 (0%)
	At the gym.....	3 (3%)
	In an exercise yard.....	5 (4%)
	At work.....	6 (5%)
	During movement.....	4 (3%)
	At education.....	0 (0%)
	At mealtimes.....	0 (0%)
	At health services.....	3 (3%)
	Visits area.....	0 (0%)
	In wing showers.....	1 (1%)
	In gym showers.....	0 (0%)
	In corridors/stairwells.....	0 (0%)
	On your landing/wing.....	7 (6%)
	In your cell.....	7 (6%)
	At religious services.....	0 (0%)

Q8.4 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?
 Yes 29 (25%)
 No..... 89 (75%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....</i>	15 (13%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Sexual abuse.....</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated.....</i>	10 (9%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken.....</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Medication.....</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Debt.....</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Drugs.....</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin.....</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs.....</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Your nationality.....</i>	3 (3%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others.....</i>	2 (2%)
<i>You are from a traveller community.....</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation.....</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Your age.....</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You have a disability.....</i>	2 (2%)
<i>You were new here.....</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Your offence/crime.....</i>	10 (9%)
<i>Gang related issues.....</i>	0 (0%)

Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?
 Yes 31 (26%)
 No..... 87 (74%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....</i>	11 (9%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Sexual abuse.....</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated.....</i>	8 (7%)
<i>Medication.....</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Debt.....</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Drugs.....</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin.....</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs.....</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your nationality.....</i>	4 (3%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others.....</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You are from a traveller community.....</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation.....</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your age.....</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You have a disability.....</i>	2 (2%)
<i>You were new here.....</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Your offence/ crime.....</i>	5 (4%)
<i>Gang related issues.....</i>	0 (0%)

Q8.8 If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff did you report it?
Not been victimised 73 (67%)
 Yes 14 (13%)
 No..... 22 (20%)

Section 9: Health services

Q9.1	How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	The doctor	8 (7%)	18 (15%)	50 (43%)	13 (11%)	21 (18%)	7 (6%)
	The nurse	10 (9%)	32 (28%)	50 (44%)	11 (10%)	5 (4%)	5 (4%)
	The dentist	17 (15%)	7 (6%)	26 (22%)	20 (17%)	19 (16%)	27 (23%)
Q9.2	What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	The doctor	8 (7%)	23 (19%)	48 (40%)	13 (11%)	12 (10%)	15 (13%)
	The nurse	13 (12%)	29 (26%)	43 (38%)	14 (12%)	6 (5%)	8 (7%)
	The dentist	28 (25%)	11 (10%)	25 (22%)	11 (10%)	14 (12%)	25 (22%)
Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
	<i>Not been</i>						7 (6%)
	<i>Very good</i>						18 (15%)
	<i>Good</i>						44 (37%)
	<i>Neither</i>						20 (17%)
	<i>Bad</i>						14 (12%)
	<i>Very bad</i>						15 (13%)
Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
	Yes.....						61 (52%)
	No.....						57 (48%)
Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your own cell?						
	<i>Not taking medication</i>						57 (49%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>						26 (22%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>						15 (13%)
	<i>No</i>						19 (16%)
Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?						
	Yes.....						24 (20%)
	No.....						94 (80%)
Q9.7	Are you being helped/supported by anyone in this prison (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?						
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>						94 (80%)
	Yes.....						8 (7%)
	No.....						15 (13%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes.....	35 (30%)
	No.....	83 (70%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes.....	30 (26%)
	No.....	85 (74%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	<i>Very easy</i>	5 (4%)

Easy.....	7 (6%)
Neither.....	4 (4%)
Difficult.....	7 (6%)
Very difficult.....	8 (7%)
Don't know.....	83 (73%)

Q10.4 Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?

Very easy.....	2 (2%)
Easy.....	0 (0%)
Neither.....	3 (3%)
Difficult.....	6 (5%)
Very difficult.....	19 (17%)
Don't know.....	85 (74%)

Q10.5 Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?

Yes.....	8 (7%)
No.....	107 (93%)

Q10.6 Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?

Yes.....	7 (6%)
No.....	108 (94%)

Q10.7 Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?

<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	79 (69%)
Yes.....	20 (18%)
No.....	15 (13%)

Q10.8 Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?

<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	85 (75%)
Yes.....	15 (13%)
No.....	14 (12%)

Q10.9 Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?

<i>Did not have a problem/did not receive help</i>	82 (72%)
Yes.....	24 (21%)
No.....	8 (7%)

Section 11: Activities

Q11.1 How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
Prison job	5 (4%)	9 (8%)	42 (36%)	10 (9%)	36 (31%)	15 (13%)
Vocational or skills training	11 (10%)	11 (10%)	53 (47%)	20 (18%)	11 (10%)	7 (6%)
Education (including basic skills)	10 (9%)	15 (13%)	55 (48%)	19 (17%)	7 (6%)	8 (7%)
Offending behaviour programmes	33 (30%)	6 (5%)	29 (26%)	13 (12%)	14 (13%)	16 (14%)

Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)				
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>				26 (23%)
	Prison job				78 (68%)
	Vocational or skills training.....				33 (29%)
	Education (including basic skills).....				44 (38%)
	Offending behaviour programmes.....				6 (5%)
Q11.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?				
		Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
	Prison job	16 (15%)	31 (29%)	48 (45%)	11 (10%)
	Vocational or skills training	24 (25%)	35 (37%)	25 (26%)	11 (12%)
	Education (including basic skills)	20 (20%)	52 (51%)	19 (19%)	11 (11%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	35 (43%)	13 (16%)	22 (27%)	11 (14%)
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				13 (11%)
	Never.....				9 (8%)
	Less than once a week.....				31 (26%)
	About once a week.....				54 (46%)
	More than once a week.....				10 (9%)
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?				
	<i>Don't use it</i>				16 (14%)
	Yes.....				81 (69%)
	No.....				20 (17%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				12 (10%)
	0.....				19 (16%)
	1 to 2.....				29 (25%)
	3 to 5.....				56 (48%)
	More than 5.....				1 (1%)
Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				17 (15%)
	0.....				16 (14%)
	1 to 2.....				22 (19%)
	3 to 5.....				31 (27%)
	More than 5.....				29 (25%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				8 (7%)
	0.....				9 (8%)
	1 to 2.....				7 (6%)
	3 to 5.....				5 (4%)
	More than 5.....				86 (75%)
Q11.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)				
	Less than 2 hours.....				8 (7%)
	2 to less than 4 hours.....				21 (18%)
	4 to less than 6 hours.....				17 (15%)
	6 to less than 8 hours.....				28 (24%)

8 to less than 10 hours.....	15 (13%)
10 hours or more.....	20 (17%)
Don't know	7 (6%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	Yes.....	66 (57%)
	No.....	49 (43%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes.....	38 (32%)
	No.....	79 (68%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes.....	20 (17%)
	No.....	97 (83%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	18 (16%)
	Very easy.....	26 (23%)
	Easy.....	29 (25%)
	Neither.....	10 (9%)
	Difficult.....	15 (13%)
	Very difficult.....	13 (11%)
	Don't know	3 (3%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	Not sentenced	31 (27%)
	Yes.....	65 (58%)
	No.....	17 (15%)
Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Not sentenced/N/A	48 (44%)
	No contact.....	6 (5%)
	Letter.....	18 (16%)
	Phone	8 (7%)
	Visit.....	52 (47%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes.....	36 (34%)
	No.....	69 (66%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	Not sentenced	31 (27%)
	Yes.....	69 (59%)
	No.....	16 (14%)

Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?		
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	47	(42%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	18	(16%)
	<i>Involved</i>	24	(21%)
	<i>Neither</i>	6	(5%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	14	(12%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	4	(4%)
Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	47	(42%)
	<i>Nobody</i>	19	(17%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	9	(8%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>	12	(11%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	36	(32%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	22	(20%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?		
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	47	(42%)
	<i>Yes</i>	47	(42%)
	<i>No</i>	7	(6%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	11	(10%)
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?		
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	47	(42%)
	<i>Yes</i>	6	(5%)
	<i>No</i>	46	(41%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	13	(12%)
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?		
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	47	(42%)
	<i>Yes</i>	24	(21%)
	<i>No</i>	26	(23%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	16	(14%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?		
	<i>Yes</i>	7	(6%)
	<i>No</i>	57	(52%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	46	(42%)
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?		
	<i>Yes</i>	23	(21%)
	<i>No</i>	85	(79%)
Q13.12	Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
		<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes
		No	
	Employment	24 (22%)	20 (19%)
	Accommodation	26 (24%)	28 (26%)
	Benefits	22 (21%)	35 (33%)
	Finances	23 (23%)	22 (22%)
	Education	26 (25%)	28 (27%)
	Drugs and alcohol	32 (30%)	32 (30%)
			63 (59%)
			53 (50%)
			48 (46%)
			56 (55%)
			51 (49%)
			41 (39%)

Q13.13 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	31 (27%)
Yes	42 (37%)
No.....	40 (35%)

Survey summary (women)

Section 1: About you

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

Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi..... 0

Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	
	Yes	0
	No.....	8
Q1.10	What is your religion?	
	None	3
	Church of England.....	3
	Catholic.....	3
	Protestant.....	0
	Other Christian denomination.....	0
	Buddhist	0
	Hindu.....	0
	Jewish.....	0
	Muslim	0
	Sikh	0
	Other.....	0
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?	
	Heterosexual/straight	9
	Homosexual/gay	0
	Bisexual.....	0
Q1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)?	
	Yes	0
	No.....	8
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	
	Yes	0
	No.....	8
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	
	Yes	8
	No.....	1
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?	
	Yes	5
	No.....	4

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	Less than 2 hours	7
	2 hours or longer.....	0
	Don't remember	1
Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	My journey was less than two hours	7
	Yes	0
	No.....	0
	Don't remember	1
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	My journey was less than two hours	7
	Yes	0
	No.....	0
	Don't remember	1

Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes.....	2
	No.....	5
	Don't remember	1
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes.....	6
	No.....	1
	Don't remember	1
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well.....	3
	Well.....	4
	Neither.....	1
	Badly.....	0
	Very badly	0
	Don't remember	0
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	7
	Yes, I received written information.....	1
	No, I was not told anything.....	0
	Don't remember	0
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes.....	4
	No.....	1
	Don't remember	3

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	4
	2 hours or longer.....	2
	Don't remember	2
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes.....	6
	No	0
	Don't remember	2
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well.....	5
	Well.....	2
	Neither.....	0
	Badly.....	0
	Very badly.....	0
	Don't remember	1
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Loss of property 1 Physical health	1

<i>Housing problems</i>	2	<i>Mental health</i>	2
<i>Contacting employers</i>	0	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners.</i>	0
<i>Contacting family</i>	0	<i>Getting phone numbers</i>	2
<i>Childcare</i>	1	<i>Other</i>	0
<i>Money worries</i>	2	<i>Did not have any problems</i>	1
<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	4		

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

<i>Yes</i>	6
<i>No</i>	1
<i>Did not have any problems</i>	1

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

<i>Tobacco</i>	4
<i>A shower</i>	4
<i>A free telephone call</i>	2
<i>Something to eat</i>	6
<i>PIN phone credit</i>	5
<i>Toiletries/basic items</i>	5
<i>Did not receive anything</i>	0

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

<i>Chaplain</i>	5
<i>Someone from health services</i>	8
<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>	5
<i>Prison shop/canteen</i>	4
<i>Did not have access to any of these</i>	0

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

<i>What was going to happen to you</i>	7
<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	5
<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>	8
<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>	7
<i>Health services</i>	7
<i>Chaplaincy</i>	7
<i>Not offered any information</i>	0

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

<i>Yes</i>	8
<i>No</i>	0
<i>Don't remember</i>	0

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

<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	0
<i>Within the first week</i>	5
<i>More than a week</i>	0
<i>Don't remember</i>	2

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

<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	0
<i>Yes</i>	5

No..... 0
 Don't remember 2

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

Did not receive an assessment..... 0
 Within the first week 1
 More than a week 3
 Don't remember 4

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1 How easy is it to:

	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	1	5	2	0	0	0
Attend legal visits?	2	6	0	0	0	0
Get bail information?	0	3	1	0	0	3

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..... 0
 Yes 2
 No..... 5

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

Yes 3
 No..... 1
 Don't know..... 4

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

	Yes	No	Don't know
Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	7	1	0
Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	8	0	0
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	8	0	0
Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	8	0	0
Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	4	3	1
Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	7	1	0
If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	7	0	1

Q4.5 What is the food like here?

Very good..... 1
 Good..... 1
 Neither..... 5
 Bad..... 1
 Very bad..... 0

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

Have not bought anything yet/don't know..... 0

	Yes.....	2
	No.....	6
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	
	Yes.....	3
	No.....	2
	Don't know.....	3
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes.....	3
	No.....	1
	Don't know/N/A.....	4
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes.....	5
	No.....	1
	Don't know/N/A.....	2
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	1
	Very easy.....	4
	Easy.....	3
	Neither.....	0
	Difficult.....	0
	Very difficult.....	0
	Don't know.....	0

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?			
	Yes.....	8		
	No.....	0		
	Don't know.....	0		
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications:			
	<i>(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with fairly?	1	6	1
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	1	7	0
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes.....			3
	No.....			2
	Don't know.....			3
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints:			
	<i>(If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with fairly?	5	1	2
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	5	3	0

Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	
	Yes.....	2
	No.....	5
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	4
	Very easy.....	1
	Easy.....	2
	Neither.....	0
	Difficult.....	1
	Very difficult.....	0

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	1
	Yes.....	7
	No.....	0
	Don't know.....	0
Q6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	1
	Yes.....	4
	No.....	1
	Don't know.....	2
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	Yes.....	0
	No.....	7
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	8
	Very well.....	0
	Well.....	0
	Neither.....	0
	Badly.....	0
	Very badly.....	0

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes.....	8
	No.....	0
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes.....	8
	No.....	0

Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	5
	No.....	3
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	Do not go on association	0
	Never	0
	Rarely	0
	Some of the time.....	0
	Most of the time.....	4
	All of the time.....	3
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I have not met him/her	0
	In the first week.....	4
	More than a week	1
	Don't remember	3
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her	0
	Very helpful.....	5
	Helpful.....	2
	Neither.....	0
	Not very helpful	0
	Not at all helpful	0

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	0
	No.....	8
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	0
	No.....	8
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe 8	<i>At mealtimes</i> 0
	<i>Everywhere</i> 0	<i>At health services</i>
	<i>Segregation unit</i> 0	<i>Visits area</i>
	<i>Association areas</i>	<i>In wing showers</i>
	<i>Reception area</i> 0	<i>In gym showers</i> 0
	<i>At the gym</i> 0	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>
	<i>In an exercise yard</i> 0	<i>On your landing/wing</i>
	<i>At work</i> 0	<i>In your cell</i> 0
	<i>During movement</i>	<i>At religious services</i>
	<i>At education</i> 0	
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	Yes	3
	No.....	5

Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	3
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	1
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	2
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	0
	<i>Medication</i>	0
	<i>Debt</i>	0
	<i>Drugs</i>	0
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	0
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	0
	<i>Your nationality</i>	0
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	0
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	1
	<i>Your age</i>	1
	<i>You have a disability</i>	0
	<i>You were new here</i>	0
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	0
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	0
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	2
	No.....	6
Q8.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	0
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	0
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	2
	<i>Medication</i>	0
	<i>Debt</i>	0
	<i>Drugs</i>	0
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	0
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	0
	<i>Your nationality</i>	0
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	0
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0
	<i>Your age</i>	0
	<i>You have a disability</i>	0
	<i>You were new here</i>	0
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	0
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	0
Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	Not been victimised	4
	Yes.....	3
	No.....	1

Section 9: Health services

Q9.1	How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	The doctor	0	2	5	0	1	0
	The nurse	0	3	5	0	0	0
	The dentist	1	0	2	3	1	1
Q9.2	What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	The doctor	0	3	5	0	0	0
	The nurse	0	5	3	0	0	0
	The dentist	2	0	2	1	1	2
Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
	<i>Not been</i>						0
	<i>Very good</i>						1
	<i>Good</i>						7
	<i>Neither</i>						0
	<i>Bad</i>						0
	<i>Very bad</i>						0
Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
	Yes.....						5
	No.....						3
Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your own cell?						
	<i>Not taking medication</i>						3
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>						4
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>						1
	<i>No</i>						0
Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?						
	Yes.....						3
	No.....						5
Q9.7	Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?						
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>						5
	Yes.....						3
	No.....						0

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes.....	4
	No.....	4
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes.....	2
	No.....	6
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	<i>Very easy</i>	0

Easy.....	1
Neither.....	0
Difficult.....	0
Very difficult.....	3
Don't know.....	4

Q10.4 Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?

Very easy.....	0
Easy.....	0
Neither.....	0
Difficult.....	0
Very difficult.....	3
Don't know.....	5

Q10.5 Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?

Yes.....	0
No.....	8

Q10.6 Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?

Yes.....	0
No.....	8

Q10.7 Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?

<i>Did not/do not have a drug problem</i>	4
Yes.....	4
No.....	0

Q10.8 Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?

<i>Did not/do not have an alcohol problem</i>	6
Yes.....	2
No.....	0

Q10.9 Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?

<i>Did not have a problem/did not receive help</i>	3
Yes.....	5
No.....	0

Section 11: Activities

Q11.1 How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
Prison job	1	2	5	0	0	0
Vocational or skills training	0	1	5	1	1	0
Education (including basic skills)	0	2	6	0	0	0
Offending behaviour programmes	1	3	2	1	1	0

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

<i>Not involved in any of these</i>	0
Prison job.....	7
Vocational or skills training.....	5

Education (including basic skills).....	6
Offending behaviour programmes.....	1

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

	<i>Not been involved</i>	Yes	No	<i>Don't know</i>
Prison job	0	1	4	2
Vocational or skills training	0	3	1	2
Education (including basic skills)	0	7	0	0
Offending behaviour programmes	0	5	0	2

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	0
<i>Never</i>	0
<i>Less than once a week</i>	0
<i>About once a week</i>	7
<i>More than once a week</i>	1

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

<i>Don't use it</i>	0
Yes.....	8
No.....	0

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	0
0.....	1
1 to 2.....	2
3 to 5.....	2
More than 5.....	2

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	0
0.....	0
1 to 2.....	4
3 to 5.....	3
More than 5.....	0

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	0
0.....	0
1 to 2.....	0
3 to 5.....	3
More than 5.....	4

Q11.9 How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	0
<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	1
<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	1
<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	2
<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	3
<i>10 hours or more</i>	0
<i>Don't know</i>	0

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	Yes	5
	No	2
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	0
	No	7
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	0
	No	7
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	0
	<i>Very easy</i>	0
	<i>Easy</i>	5
	<i>Neither</i>	1
	<i>Difficult</i>	0
	<i>Very difficult</i>	0
	<i>Don't know</i>	0

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	1
	Yes	6
	No	0
Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Not sentenced/N/A</i>	1
	<i>No contact</i>	0
	<i>Letter</i>	1
	<i>Phone</i>	1
	<i>Visit</i>	6
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	4
	No	1
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	1
	Yes	5
	No	1
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	2
	<i>Very involved</i>	3
	<i>Involved</i>	3
	<i>Neither</i>	0

Not very involved 0
 Not at all involved 0

Q13.6 Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced 2
 Nobody 0
 Offender supervisor 0
 Offender manager 1
 Named/ personal officer 6
 Staff from other departments 3

Q13.7 Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced 2
 Yes 4
 No 1
 Don't know 1

Q13.8 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced 2
 Yes 0
 No 4
 Don't know 2

Q13.9 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced 2
 Yes 1
 No 3
 Don't know 2

Q13.10 Do you have a needs based custody plan?

Yes 1
 No 1
 Don't know 6

Q13.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?

Yes 4
 No 4

Q13.12 Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	0	4	4
Accommodation	1	2	4
Benefits	0	3	4
Finances	0	3	4
Education	0	7	1
Drugs and alcohol	1	6	1

Q13.13 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

Not sentenced 1
 Yes 5
 No 1

Main comparator



Prisoner survey responses HMP La Moye(men) 2013

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

Key to tables

		HMP La Moye	Local prisons comparator
	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		120	5916
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	3%	6%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	74%	68%
1.3	Are you on recall?	1%	10%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	6%	21%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	3%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	20%	13%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	97%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	13%	25%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	5%	12%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	4%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	13%	21%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	5%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	39%	30%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	41%	53%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	1%	18%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	23%	39%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	21%	9%
2.4	Was the van clean?	53%	64%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	87%	77%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71%	67%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	81%	67%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	6%	5%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	49%	81%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP La Moye	Local prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	71%	48%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	85%	75%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	81%	60%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	55%	74%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	11%	14%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	9%	24%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	4%	6%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	16%	31%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	5%	6%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	23%	22%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	14%	21%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	17%	17%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	12%	19%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	5%	8%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	22%	30%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	59%	40%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	67%	86%
3.6	A shower?	61%	33%
3.6	A free telephone call?	20%	57%
3.6	Something to eat?	63%	78%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	68%	57%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	76%	60%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP La Moyle	Local prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:			
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	47%	50%
3.7	Someone from health services?	76%	73%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	38%	40%
3.7	Prison shop/canteen?	40%	16%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:			
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	59%	48%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	39%	48%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	56%	40%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	59%	45%
3.8	Health services?	63%	52%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	47%	47%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	85%	74%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	61%	78%
For those who have been on an induction course:			
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	53%	58%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	71%	74%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:			
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	72%	41%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	73%	58%
4.1	Get bail information?	42%	22%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	46%	39%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	51%	37%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:			
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	93%	54%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	80%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	83%	80%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	89%	62%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	53%	37%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	78%	64%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	60%	27%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	52%	24%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	75%	47%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	68%	58%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	56%	54%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	60%	55%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	59%	47%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP La Moye	Local prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	91%	81%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	73%	58%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	79%	48%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	60%	55%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	53%	33%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	62%	36%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	15%	16%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	17%	21%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	66%	47%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	38%	44%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	3%	7%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/well by staff?	79%	38%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	94%	73%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	93%	73%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	51%	32%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	41%	18%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	91%	44%
	For those with a personal officer:		
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	70%	65%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP La Moye	Local prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	18%	40%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	3%	16%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	25%	22%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	10%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	7%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	13%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	1%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	9%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	4%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP La Moye	Local prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	26%	26%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	11%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	5%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	2%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	39%	33%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP La Moye	Local prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	58%	26%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	73%	51%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	29%	10%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:		
9.2	The doctor?	64%	43%
9.2	The nurse?	72%	57%
9.2	The dentist?	42%	31%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	56%	39%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	52%	50%
	For those currently taking medication:		
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	68%	64%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	20%	34%
	For those who have problems:		
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	35%	40%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	30%	35%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	26%	27%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	10%	29%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	2%	13%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	7%	8%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	6%	8%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	57%	65%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	51%	60%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
10.9	Was the support helpful?	75%	79%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP La Moye	Local prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	44%	34%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	57%	30%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	62%	44%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	31%	19%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	68%	44%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	29%	9%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	38%	27%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	6%	8%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	85%	69%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	35%	42%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	75%	53%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	49%	50%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	81%	65%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	64%	58%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	57%	51%
	For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	28%	48%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	55%	35%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	69%	34%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	49%	31%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	52%	37%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	75%	47%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	17%	10%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	57%	35%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	32%	45%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	17%	33%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	48%	36%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP La Moye	Local prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
For those who are sentenced:			
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	80%	61%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:			
13.2	No contact?	10%	42%
13.2	Contact by letter?	30%	28%
13.2	Contact by phone?	13%	16%
13.2	Contact by visit?	84%	34%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	34%	32%
For those who are sentenced:			
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	81%	39%
For those with a sentence plan:			
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	64%	57%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:			
13.6	Nobody?	29%	43%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	13%	32%
13.6	Offender manager?	18%	29%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	55%	14%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	34%	20%
For those with a sentence plan:			
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	72%	61%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	10%	27%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	36%	31%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	7%	6%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	21%	15%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:			
13.12	Employment?	24%	31%
13.12	Accommodation?	34%	44%
13.12	Benefits?	42%	46%
13.12	Finances?	28%	27%
13.12	Education?	35%	33%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	44%	48%
For those who are sentenced:			
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	52%	46%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (men - ethnicity and foreign national) HMP La Moye 2013

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners
	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	103	24	93
1.3	Are you sentenced?	95%	71%	83%	72%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	58%	13%		
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	97%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%	97%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			41%	7%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	0%	0%	0%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	44%	0%	13%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	22%	12%	13%	13%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	6%	3%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	58%	36%	53%	36%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	79%	70%	74%	69%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	82%	80%	68%	84%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	74%	86%	83%	85%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	84%	80%	87%	78%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	65%	55%	52%	56%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	84%	74%	64%	78%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	74%	86%	80%	87%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	68%	61%	80%	56%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	79%	71%	70%	72%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	79%	94%	87%	93%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95%	98%	97%	98%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	68%	50%	58%	51%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	68%	49%	53%	50%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	65%	75%	62%	79%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	79%	65%	67%	67%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	68%	54%	69%	51%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	53%	59%	62%	59%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	100%	90%	97%	91%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	72%	58%	68%	58%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	72%	66%	55%	68%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	65%	35%	45%	34%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	4%	3%	3%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	95%	94%	97%	93%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	94%	92%	97%	91%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	42%	42%	45%	41%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	84%	92%	83%	93%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	26%	17%	13%	20%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	5%	3%	3%	4%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	53%	21%	30%	23%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	21%	7%	10%	9%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	21%	1%	13%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	16%	1%	0%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	16%	1%	10%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	16%	0%	3%	1%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	58%	22%	33%	25%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	21%	5%	10%	7%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	21%	0%	10%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	5%	0%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	26%	0%	13%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	16%	0%	3%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	68%	56%	53%	58%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	74%	72%	67%	74%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	47%	54%	48%	54%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	21%	21%	17%	22%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	22%	9%	16%	10%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	100%	64%	71%	67%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	50%	26%	32%	29%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	65%	35%	41%	38%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	17%	4%	4%	5%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	53%	56%	45%	57%
11.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	58%	48%	31%	53%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	53%	53%	41%	54%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	68%	77%	55%	80%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	16%	18%	17%	18%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	44%	32%	32%	34%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	6%	19%	18%	17%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (men - disability, age over 50) HMP La Moye 2013

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

Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability		Do not consider themselves to have a disability	
				Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	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	104	20	98
1.3	Are you sentenced?	74%	74%	76%	74%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	21%	21%	12%	23%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories?)	21%	11%	4%	15%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	0%	0%	0%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	21%	3%	0%	7%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			4%	13%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	16%	4%	4%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	26%	40%	46%	38%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	74%	70%	80%	69%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	78%	81%	83%	80%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	68%	88%	89%	84%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	74%	82%	89%	79%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	72%	53%	69%	51%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	83%	74%	64%	78%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	79%	85%	87%	85%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	58%	61%	64%	60%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	79%	71%	83%	69%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	74%	95%	100%	91%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95%	98%	96%	98%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	47%	55%	67%	51%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	58%	50%	56%	51%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	65%	76%	76%	76%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	68%	68%	69%	66%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	42%	59%	58%	56%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	47%	61%	57%	60%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	94%	91%	89%	93%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	40%	62%	67%	59%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	67%	67%	69%	65%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	24%	40%	39%	37%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	6%	3%	0%	4%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	95%	94%	96%	93%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	78%	94%	88%	93%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	42%	42%	50%	41%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	84%	92%	89%	92%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	32%	16%	4%	21%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	16%	2%	0%	4%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	50%	22%	20%	25%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	28%	6%	12%	8%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	17%	2%	4%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	6%	2%	4%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	17%	1%	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	4%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	17%	0%	0%	2%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	47%	23%	20%	27%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	16%	6%	4%	7%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	16%	1%	4%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	5%	0%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	16%	2%	0%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	16%	0%	0%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	44%	60%	75%	55%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	65%	73%	76%	71%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	79%	47%	80%	46%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	53%	16%	4%	23%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	22%	9%	13%	11%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	56%	69%	61%	68%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	22%	29%	27%	29%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	17%	41%	39%	38%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	6%	0%	7%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	32%	58%	56%	55%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	21%	53%	40%	50%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	35%	54%	56%	51%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	68%	77%	61%	78%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	21%	17%	4%	20%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	28%	33%	16%	37%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	17%	18%	16%	18%



Prisoner survey responses HMP La Moye 2013 (VP vs Main)

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

		vulnerable Prisoner Unit (J Wing)	All Other Wings (G, L and K Wing)
	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		41	78
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	2%	4%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	75%	73%
1.3	Are you on recall?	2%	0%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	8%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	0%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	10%	27%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	10%	15%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	0%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	6%	5%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	8%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	16%	10%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	46%	35%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	48%	38%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	2%	0%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	85%	87%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	75%	68%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	84%	79%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	37%	55%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	71%	70%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	88%	84%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	81%	80%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	vulnerable Prisoner Unit (J Wing)	All Other Wings (G, L and K Wing)
	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		
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	54%	55%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	8%	13%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	10%	9%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	6%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	8%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	6%	5%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	25%	22%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	22%	9%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	15%	17%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	17%	8%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	15%	0%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	12%	27%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	51%	76%
3.6	A shower?	59%	63%
3.6	A free telephone call?	12%	25%
3.6	Something to eat?	46%	70%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	69%	67%
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	75%	76%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	33%	53%
3.7	Someone from health services?	71%	78%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	41%	35%
3.7	Prison shop/canteen?	31%	46%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	52%	61%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	30%	44%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	52%	57%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	50%	64%
3.8	Health services?	55%	66%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	32%	53%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	78%	89%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	64%	59%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	73%	70%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	vulnerable Prisoner Unit (J Wing)	All Other Wings (G, L and K Wing)
	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			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	80%	69%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	84%	67%
4.1	Get bail information?	42%	43%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	56%	40%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	37%	59%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	92%	92%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	98%	97%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	84%	81%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	94%	86%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	64%	47%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	73%	80%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	57%	60%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	35%	60%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	81%	71%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	78%	61%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	48%	60%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	57%	60%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	64%	56%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	92%	91%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	60%	59%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	17%	16%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	10%	20%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	75%	61%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	28%	44%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	2%	3%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	90%	96%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	88%	95%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	42%	55%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	32%	45%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	90%	92%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	vulnerable Prisoner Unit (J Wing)	All Other Wings (G, L and K Wing)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	31%	11%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	6%	3%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	47%	13%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	31%	3%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	8%	1%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	0%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	20%	3%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	8%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	6%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	26%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	0%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	vulnerable Prisoner Unit (J Wing)	All Other Wings (G, L and K Wing)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	30%	24%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	8%	9%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	0%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	6%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	6%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	10%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	0%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	vulnerable Prisoner Unit (J Wing)	All Other Wings (G, L and K Wing)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	51%	62%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	60%	79%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	29%	27%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	60%	46%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	32%	13%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	28%	31%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	32%	22%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	22%	4%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	2%	1%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	12%	4%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	10%	4%
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	35%	49%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	61%	53%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	67%	58%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	16%	42%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	71%	67%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	38%	25%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	45%	35%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	6%	5%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	68%	49%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	80%	63%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	37%	55%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	60%	47%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	71%	78%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	12%	20%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	53%	59%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	28%	35%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	22%	15%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	58%	44%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	28%	39%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	7%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	9%	27%