

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP North Sea Camp

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

3–13 July 2017

This inspection was carried out with assistance from colleagues at the General Pharmaceutical Council and in partnership with the following bodies:



Crown copyright 2017

This publication, excluding logos, is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at the address below or: hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/>

Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
Clive House
5th floor
70 Petty France
London
SW1H 9EX
England

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	17
Section 2. Respect	25
Section 3. Purposeful activity	37
Section 4. Resettlement	45
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice	53
Section 6. Appendices	57
Appendix I: Inspection team	57
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	59
Appendix III: Prison population profile	65
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	69

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 in our 'Guide for writing inspection reports' on our website at: <http://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

Introduction

HMP North Sea Camp is a category D resettlement prison near Boston in Lincolnshire. At the time of the inspection it held just over 400 men. Most were serving long sentences of more than four years, around half were serving indeterminate sentences, and about 60% were sex offenders. The population was fully integrated and sex offenders were not separated from others. The prison was last inspected in July 2014, when there was still concern about a serious incident that took place during a release on temporary licence (ROTL). As a result of this incident, weaknesses were identified in the resettlement process, which was of course the core purpose of the establishment.

This inspection found the prison had moved on dramatically in the intervening three years. On this occasion, we assessed resettlement as 'good' – our highest assessment – reflecting the excellent progress that had been made. In 2014, we made 12 recommendations in the area of resettlement; on this occasion, we found that all of those recommendations had been either fully or partially achieved. Indeed, across all our healthy prison tests, no less than 70% of our recommendations had been achieved or partially achieved. This was refreshing, in stark contrast to many lesser performing prisons, and it was no coincidence that the prison had made such significant progress.

North Sea Camp was a safe prison, with violence and the use of force at negligible levels. There was no segregation unit, and no need for one. The fact that the population was fully integrated yet there was little if any hostility towards sex offenders was a tribute to the ethos of the prison and the care that was taken to generate an atmosphere of peaceful co-existence and tolerance.

Relationships between staff and prisoners were respectful, which was a major strength of the prison and the basis on which much of the progress of the past few years was clearly built. The senior leadership, and indeed all staff, were committed to producing a safe and decent environment in which the men could make progress towards eventual release and successful resettlement.

However, further progress in the area of respect had been jeopardised because of the poor state of the accommodation. The residential units were old, far too many of the rooms were too small to be used for double occupancy and the showers and toilets urgently needed refurbishment. There was a lack of suitable association areas. However, it was clear that a comparatively modest investment could deliver significant improvements.

The prison had several houses outside the gate known as the Jubilee units, which offered men coming towards the end of their sentences excellent opportunities to gain resettlement experience. This high-quality provision helped men to re-enter the world of independent living. However, several of these houses were unused, virtually derelict and needed refurbishment. We were told apprentices from the prison population could have been used to cut the cost of such a project. I would strongly encourage the prison to explore the feasibility of this approach, or of constructing a new building on the extensive site.

The inspection also found a tension between performance measures used by HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) which judged performance based on the numbers of prisoners placed in work within the prison, and what should have been the objective of the prison, which was to maximise the use of ROTL. It seems that the HMPPS performance measure had been designed for the closed estate, and it should be revisited to make it appropriate for open prisons. As it stood, there was an incentive not to achieve in full the core purpose of the prison. Despite this anomaly, the overall management of ROTL required attention so that the delays that sometimes occurred, leading to frustration among prisoners, could be understood and analysed.

Overall, HMP North Sea Camp had made very real progress since the last inspection. It was a safe and decent prison with some bold policies relating to the management of its complex population, and

it was now a successful establishment. The detail of this report will provide an understanding of the foundations of the prison's improvement and offer lessons that can be learned.

Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

September 2017

Fact page

Task of the establishment

An open male category D prison holding a large proportion of indeterminate sentence prisoners and those convicted of sex offences.

Prison status

Public

Region

The East

Number held

411 (on 3 July 2017)

Certified normal accommodation

420

Operational capacity

420

Date of last full inspection

14–25 July 2014

Brief history

HMP North Sea Camp, which opened in 1935, was originally a borstal. The original staff and trainees were from HMP Stafford. They established a tented camp at the site while they began to build permanent buildings. They also built a new sea bank to reclaim land from The Wash. The work was completed in 1979. In 1988, North Sea Camp became an adult male open prison.

Short description of residential units

Accommodation was provided across five residential units, with single accommodation available for up to 40 prisoners and the remaining facilities being shared rooms and dormitories. In addition, there were a further 66 beds within four detached houses, known as the Jubilee units, which were used for long-term prisoners living independently.

Name of governor

Michelle Quirke

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service provider

Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust

Substance misuse services provider

Addaction

Learning and skills providers

Novus

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Mabel Brooks

Community rehabilitation company (CRC)
Humberside, Lincolnshire and North Yorkshire CRC

About this inspection and report

A1 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, secure training centres, immigration detention facilities, police and court custody and military detention.

A2 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.

A3 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 tests 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.

A4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. There are four possible judgements: In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS).

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

- A5 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 reviewed for implementation at future inspections
 - **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.
- A6 Five key sources of evidence are used by inspectors: 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 and analysis, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Evidence from different sources is triangulated to strengthen the validity of our assessments.
- A7 Since April 2013, all our inspections have been unannounced, other than in exceptional circumstances. This replaces the previous system of announced and unannounced full main inspections with full or short follow-ups to review progress. All our inspections now follow up recommendations from the last full inspection.
- A8 All inspections of prisons are conducted jointly with Ofsted or Estyn (Wales), the Care Quality Commission, the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) and HM Inspectorate of Probation. This joint work ensures expert knowledge is deployed in inspections and avoids multiple inspection visits.

This report

- A9 This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of prisoners and conditions in prisons*. The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report. Section 5 collates all recommendations and examples of good practice arising from the inspection. Appendix II lists the recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved.
- A10 Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and IV respectively.
- A11 Findings from the survey of prisoners and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix V of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.¹

¹ The significance level is set at 0.01, which means that there is only a 1% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

Summary

Safety

- S1** *Despite long journeys to the prison most prisoners felt escort staff treated them well. Reception and arrangements during prisoners' early days were generally good. Some prisoners felt unsafe when they first arrived at the prison but their concerns appeared to be relatively short-lived. Levels of violence were low and although the use of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) procedures for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm was higher than at the last inspection, most were used for relatively short periods. Security arrangements were proportionate and the prison made substantial efforts to avoid returning prisoners to closed conditions. Disciplinary procedures were well managed and support for prisoners with substance misuse issues was good. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2** *At the last inspection in 2014 we found that outcomes for prisoners in North Sea Camp were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and five had not been achieved.*
- S3** Prisoners often had to travel long distances to North Sea Camp but they told us escort staff treated them well. Prisoners also indicated that they had received written information about the prison before arriving.
- S4** The reception was small but men were processed efficiently and were not routinely searched on arrival. Prisoners spent relatively little time in reception and more than in similar prisons said reception staff treated them well. Induction staff knew who new arrivals were, but no additional first night checks were made. Some prisoners felt unsafe when they first arrived, possibly a reflection of the integrated regime, but their anxieties appeared short-lived. However, the prison needed to explore the matter further. Prisoners were positive about the induction programme and said it covered everything they needed to know.
- S5** Levels of violence were very low. There had been no fights in the previous six months and only two assaults – one against a member of staff and another against a prisoner. In our survey, a small proportion of men said they felt unsafe at the time of the inspection. It was encouraging that a relatively large number of men who said they had been victimised, also said they would report it to staff.
- S6** The safer custody team managed referrals and concerns appropriately. Information-sharing between security and safer custody required some improvement. Exit surveys were conducted and induction questionnaires were distributed, but more needed to be done to ensure trends and patterns were understood.
- S7** Levels of self-harm were higher than expected, but incidents were not serious. New initiatives to support the prevention of self-harm had been introduced, such as a trigger database, highlighting key dates that could be difficult for some prisoners. Although the number of ACCTs opened in the previous six months was slightly higher than at our last inspection, most were only open for a short time. Men received a good level of care through the ACCT process. Documents were good and included input from healthcare staff where appropriate. Prisoners used Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) well and access was appropriate.

- S8 Links with the local safeguarding adults board were appropriate. A safeguarding adults policy was in place and the safer custody and healthcare teams worked well together.
- S9 Security arrangements were proportionate. The prison aimed to provide prisoners coming from closed conditions with a supportive environment and risks they posed were managed proportionately. Intelligence was analysed, tested and used well to inform the prison's response to emerging threats. However, too many requests for targeted room searches were not processed and not all suspicion drug tests were carried out. We saw many examples of prisoners being well supported. Sixty percent of those reviewed and considered for an immediate return to closed conditions received support so they could stay at North Sea Camp. There had been a steady decrease in those absconding, as well as in the number of prisoners returned to closed conditions. Suitability and monitoring meetings were multidisciplinary, well organised and appropriately managed.
- S10 All prisoners were placed on the enhanced level of the incentive and earned privileges scheme on arrival in recognition of their transfer from closed to open conditions. The opportunity to remain in open conditions and apply for release on temporary licence (ROTL) provided prisoners with the main incentive to behave well.
- S11 The number of adjudications was low. There was no evidence to suggest that prisoners were returned to closed conditions purely because of a proven adjudication. Force was used very infrequently and only one incident, which did not involve full restraint, took place in the previous six months. The prison continued to manage well without a segregation unit.
- S12 There was a 'whole prison' drug strategy and substance use charity Addaction worked collaboratively with all key staff. The small Addaction team provided a good range of psychosocial interventions, which included individual and group programmes. Fifty-four men were receiving support and a number of peer-led initiatives promoted the active involvement of prisoners. There was little demand for the clinical management of substance misuse, but arrangements were sound and delivered flexible patient-centred outcomes.

Respect

S13 *The general environment was well maintained and attractive but much of the accommodation was poor, cramped and inadequately furnished. Relationships between staff and prisoners were excellent. The recent re-launch of diversity and equality work was welcome, but the absence of equality monitoring was disappointing. Faith and religious support was generally positive and responses to complaints were improving. Physical and mental health support was reasonable. Food was very good and prisoners appreciated it. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S14 *At the last inspection in 2014 we found that outcomes for prisoners in North Sea Camp were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 25 recommendations in the area of respect.² At this follow-up inspection we found that 10 of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved, 11 had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

S15 The grounds were well maintained and attractive. Apart from the Jubilee units, the accommodation was poor. All communal areas and most rooms were clean and we saw no graffiti or rubbish. There was a long waiting list for single rooms, which were allocated fairly

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

but many men found sharing difficult. Men appreciated having privacy keys, but in many rooms the furniture and storage facilities were inadequate. There was good access to toilets and showers, but some were unsuitable. The provision of essential kit was reasonably good. The application process was tracked and most men (83% of our survey respondents) felt applications were dealt with fairly. Property received by the prison was well managed. The prisoner advice centre was a positive initiative and provided men with useful information.

- S16 In our survey, 93% of men said that most staff treated them with respect, higher than at comparator prisons and compared with our last inspection (both 80%). Staff-prisoner relationships were strong. We observed good, supportive relationships across the prison and men told us that staff were approachable. Consultation was reasonably good and developing. Prisoners could get involved through a monthly information session and the prisoner representative group.
- S17 Equality and diversity work had recently been re-launched. Each protected characteristic group was now supported by a small team comprising prisoner representatives, a senior management team member and a probation officer. The new scheme was promising, but not yet embedded. The equalities hub was an excellent source of support and advice but there was still no equality monitoring to ensure specific groups were not disadvantaged.
- S18 Black and minority ethnic men were more negative in our survey in a few areas, but despite this we found no other evidence of adverse outcomes. Some men with physical disabilities struggled to find employment or to move around the site and needed more support, although personal emergency evacuation plans were appropriate and a buddy scheme was in place. The care offered to transgender prisoners was reasonable and several staff had received appropriate training. Some gay and bisexual men felt it was safe to be open about their sexuality, despite some inappropriate comments from other prisoners. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender awareness events were held regularly.
- S19 Most men were positive about faith provision, although the coordinating chaplain was the only employed member of the team. Prior to April the post had been vacant for six months. Two other funded posts had also been vacant. Sessional chaplains provided support for most faiths. The multi-faith room was adequate, but the washing facilities required refurbishment.
- S20 The volume of complaints received was higher than we would have expected, suggesting that prisoners were not afraid to complain. Responses to complaints were generally reasonable and managers now routinely analysed the quality of responses and data. The legal visits facilities remained insufficiently private.
- S21 Clinical governance of healthcare was sound and good relationships had been established across the prison. A range of appropriate primary care services were provided and waiting lists for clinics were short, except for a significant number of men who were waiting too long for routine podiatry care.
- S22 Overall, the management of medicines was adequate. Prisoners, however, were unhappy about queuing arrangements, the lack of confidential space and the inflexible approach to collecting in-possession medicines. Access to dental services was a concern and men waited too long to access community provision. The small mental health team delivered an appropriate range of accessible and responsive services, except for counselling support, which was inadequate. Social care arrangements were appropriate.
- S23 In our survey, prisoners were extremely positive about the food. Portion sizes and the quality were good. All prisoners could eat together and those in the Jubilee units could cater for themselves. The prison shop offered a full range of products, including religious items, which were unavailable at the last inspection. Prisoners arriving at the prison received a

variety of reception packs (containing items such as biscuits, sweets and orange juice). A regular drop-in service provided prisoners with a quick and easy way to resolve financial and shop queries.

Purposeful activity

S24 *Prisoners were not locked in their rooms and restrictions of movement were minimal. Progress had been made since the last inspection to increase the range and number of employment places. More data analysis was required. Outcomes in work, education and training had, broadly, improved. Despite good community involvement, only a small number of prisoners worked outside the prison gates. Teaching and learning were reasonably good. The introduction of the virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities) was positive, but prisoners were not using it. The library was good and the gym provision was reasonable.*
Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

S25 *At the last inspection in 2014 we found that outcomes for prisoners in North Sea Camp were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that eight of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and three had not been achieved.*

S26 Men were not locked in their rooms and had their own key, promoting independence. A good range of social and recreational activities were provided in the evenings and weekends but association areas were too small and some games equipment needed replacing.

S27 Managers had made significant progress in increasing the number and range of employment placements. Despite good employer involvement, it was disappointing that relatively few prisoners worked outside the prison on a regular basis. Senior leaders and managers had successfully introduced vocational training pathways. A complete curriculum review was in hand. None of the staff analysed data sufficiently to monitor the quality of provision or to plan further improvements.

S28 Education and the vocational training provision were good overall. Learning was well planned, enabling learners to develop knowledge, skills and an understanding of relevant topics. Prisoners received good support from enthusiastic tutors, instructors and peer mentors, which helped raise their achievements. Learners received good oral and written feedback that encouraged them to produce work of a good standard. English and maths were not integrated well enough into other subject areas, including some industrial areas. Prisoners had insufficient access to computing facilities and to the virtual campus.

S29 Prisoners' behaviour was very good in classes and in work and levels of mutual respect were high. Learners also developed very good employment skills in the workshops. They implemented safe working practices in work areas.

S30 Success rates on most courses were high. Functional skills success rates in maths required improvement but had been better in the current academic year. Many learners made good progress in learning.

S31 The prison provided very good library facilities, offering a wide range of resources. The gym provided men with a good range of recreational and training opportunities. Changing and showering facilities were not sufficiently private.

Resettlement

S32 *Strategic management was generally good. The prison had a clear sense of purpose. ROTL was central to its function and much of its work was good, well managed and efficient. However, delays in processes were not monitored sufficiently or relayed and explained to prisoners consistently. The roles and functions of the community rehabilitation company (CRC) required clarifying. The work of the offender management unit (OMU) was well integrated and involved prison, psychology and probation departments. Interactions with prisoners were focused and effective. Some further work on risk management planning and clarifying pre-release multi-agency public protection arrangement (MAPPA) levels was required. Support for work with families was generally good. Temporary licences to support family contact was extensive. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

S33 *At the last inspection in 2014 we found that outcomes for prisoners in North Sea Camp were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that four of the recommendations had been achieved and eight had been partially achieved.*

S34 The strategic management of resettlement was effective and the prison had made progress and improvements since the last inspection. Much of the resettlement work focused on ROTL. The prison's strategy and policy were informed by an offender needs analysis, but did not include readily available information from offender assessment system (OASys) documents or basic custody screenings. The OMU directed the work of other departments, including the resettlement team, which implemented the OMU's decisions. ROTL was used safely and effectively to prepare men for release and to establish effective family ties. Assessment processes for ROTL involved behavioural insights from the psychology department, were robust and enabled appropriate decisions to be made, but there remained significant delays, especially with the first accompanied visit. While some delays were justified, the reasons for other delays were less clear and monitoring was inconsistent and unreliable. Prisoners felt uninformed and frustrated.

S35 The work of the OMU was good. It was well integrated with internal and external partners. Prisoners benefited from a coordinated approach to case management. The escalation process was reducing the backlog of OASys. Offender supervisors made persistent attempts to obtain information from community-based offender managers. The OASys documents completed by prison offender supervisors were variable. Assessments did not recognise or analyse the inherent risk issues sufficiently. There were some effective risk management strategies in place, but risk management plans did not always reflect them. Some risk management plans were not relevant to open conditions and management oversight was not critical enough. Contact between prisoners and offender supervisors was planned and sessions were well recorded and appropriate for prisoners' needs.

S36 Public protection arrangements were, overall, sound. MAPPA categories and levels were identified on arrival but were not always clarified or confirmed prior to release.

S37 Reintegration planning started promptly after arrival and was tailored to prisoners' individual needs. However, the roles and responsibilities of the OMU and Shelter (commissioned by the Humberside, Lincolnshire and North Yorkshire CRC to provide resettlement services at the prison) at each stage of the process were unclear. The CRC's involvement with prisoners was too often late and ineffective. The Jubilee units were excellent and prepared men for life after release in the community.

- S38 Most prisoners were released to approved premises. The CRC provision was not yet effective enough. The National Careers Service provided prisoners with a good service. No discrete pre-release course was offered, although there were some employability courses.
- S39 Prisoners were seen prior to discharge and appropriately supported if the healthcare department received sufficient notice of release. The GP could not provide a prescription for use in the community, but prisoners received a supply of prescribed medicine to take with them. The mental health team liaised with local community teams to support discharge planning where appropriate. Addaction had strong links to local services and could direct men to community provision and organise aftercare.
- S40 Some finance benefit and debt provision was available, and in some cases men had used ROTL to set up bank accounts and arrange benefits in advance of their release.
- S41 Family engagement work required development. However, over 250 men had been on a temporary licence for family contact purposes in the previous six months. Few men were local to the prison so it was helpful that prison transport collected visitors from the train station. It was positive that family days were held regularly during school holidays, but they were under-resourced. Visits arrangements were efficient and the visits room was relaxed. Families told us, and we observed, that gate and visits staff were friendly and helpful.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S42 **Concern:** As at our last inspection, rooms that were used as doubles in Harrison, Llewellyn and North units were cramped, and far too small for two men. There was inadequate space for storage and no space for desks or chairs.

Recommendation: Rooms designed for one man should not accommodate two and men should have space to store their possessions properly.

- S43 **Concern:** Despite the development of the employment and community engagement manager role too few external work placements were available for prisoners on ROTL. This had a negative impact on the effectiveness of prisoners' preparation for release and future employment.

Recommendation: The number of external work placements should be increased and provide suitable preparation for employment on release.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.1 Men often had to travel for long distances to the prison, which resulted in long periods of time in escort vans and overnight stays at other establishments. More men in our survey than in comparator prisons said they had spent more than two hours in the van. Those we spoke to, however, were positive about how escort staff treated them and said they had been offered a sandwich and a drink during their journey.
- I.2 In our survey, more men than in comparator prisons and compared with the previous inspection said they had received written information about the prison before arriving. Although the prison did not receive any transfers during our inspection, we were told the reception was kept open at lunchtime to ensure men who arrived then were held on vans for the least amount of time possible.

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.

- I.3 Reception was small but efficient. Men had access to a toilet on arrival and reception orderlies provided refreshments. More men in our survey than comparator prisons and compared with the previous inspection said they had been treated well or very well in reception. Men were not routinely searched on arrival.
- I.4 We were told men had a private one-to-one interview with reception staff and a healthcare assessment in reception while their property was being processed. They then met induction orderlies, collected their property and were taken to the induction wing. In our survey, more men than in comparator prisons said they were held in reception for less than two hours.
- I.5 On their first night, the induction orderly spoke with all men. They received a bed pack consisting of appropriate kit and bedding and had a tour of the prison. Men could use the phone and shower on their first night and received an advance on their 'spends' account (money a prisoner has available to spend in the prison) to buy canteen items.
- I.6 Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) introduced themselves to new prisoners during the induction every evening and safer custody orderlies completed a meet and greet with all new arrivals within 24 hours. Induction staff knew which men were new, but no additional first night checks were carried out.
- I.7 On arrival men were located in dormitories in unit South I. In our survey, more men than in comparator prisons said they did not feel safe on their first night. Some men spoke about the

fears they had about living in dormitories having come from closed conditions. Others told us the mixed population at North Sea Camp caused apprehension. There was also evidence suggesting that other men were intimidating new arrivals, but the prison had taken action to address the problem. Nevertheless, men overwhelmingly believed staff would help and support them if they had any concerns.

- I.8** Induction consisted of a rolling one-week programme that men joined when they arrived. The programme was published and covered all areas. More men in our survey than at comparator prisons said the induction programme covered everything they needed to know about the prison. Induction talks took place in the association area of the induction unit, which was also used by men in the neighbouring unit, South 2. This meant it was busy and often distracting for those on induction (see also paragraph 3.2).
- I.9** Many men told us they had to find their own accommodation after induction, which was inappropriate and caused some men anxiety.
- I.10** All prisoners completed a feedback questionnaire after their first week at the prison, which asked about their experiences of arriving at North Sea Camp and the induction.

Recommendations

- I.11** **The prison should determine why some men feel unsafe on their first night and address any arising issues.**
- I.12** **Induction should take place in a quiet room without other men distracting new arrivals.**
- I.13** **Men should be supported by unit staff to find their next accommodation upon completing their induction.**

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.14** Levels of violence were very low and lower than at our last inspection. There had not been any fights in the six months prior to our inspection and only two assaults over the same period, one against staff and another against a prisoner.
- I.15** In our survey, a small proportion of men said they felt unsafe at the time of the inspection and they told us they would report concerns to staff and receive support. In our survey, 40% of men who claimed they had been victimised, said they had reported it to staff, compared with only 26% in comparator prisons. Men we spoke to felt confident staff would deal with their concerns appropriately. A 'don't ask, don't tell' policy was used well to address the fears of men who were vulnerable because of their offence about living in a mixed population. Men told us they were aware of the policy, but some vulnerable prisoners still felt anxious.
- I.16** The safer custody team kept a violence reduction log to track all referrals for minor antisocial behaviour and ensured that appropriate action was taken. Some incidents resulted

in men being monitored. Less serious incidents were dealt with through mediation while those that were more worrying would be referred for a suitability review (see paragraph I.35). Staff had no access to mediation training.

- I.17 The flow of information between safer custody and security departments was not always sufficient and one department was aware of some incidents of alleged bullying, while the other was not. Although appropriate action was taken after incidents were considered, the departments operated in isolation, which meant neither had a full picture of antisocial behaviour in the prison. As a result, incidents arose that could have been avoided, had information been shared sooner.
- I.18 The safer custody meeting met regularly and considered lessons that could be learned and training needs; it also had oversight of a safer custody action plan. Listeners and safer custody orderlies represented prisoners at the meeting. Key departments, such as security did not always attend, submitting written reports instead. However, gaps in the information held between the two departments were not sufficiently identified. The meeting involved some data analysis, including an analysis of antisocial behaviour trends from the violence reduction log, but more was required.
- I.19 Arrangements for consulting men on safer custody were good. A monthly safer custody forum was held in the chapel and induction questionnaires, newsletters and a violence reduction survey had been distributed. Exit interviews were also conducted. Two safer custody orderlies played a key role in gathering information and receiving referrals from prisoners where there were concerns. They received support from safer custody volunteer representatives in each unit.

Recommendations

- I.20 **Staff facilitating mediation between prisoners should be appropriately trained.**
(Repeated recommendation I.19)
- I.21 **Links between safer custody and security should be strengthened to ensure both departments gain a full picture of antisocial behaviour at the prison.**
- I.22 **The prison should improve its analysis of antisocial behaviour so trends can be identified at the earliest opportunity and action taken promptly.**

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.

- I.23 There had been five incidents of self-harm in the previous six months, which was higher than usual in open conditions. However, incidents were not serious. Men who were struggling were provided with in-room activities to occupy them and a 'trigger date' database was being developed to ensure men could receive support on potentially difficult dates, such as anniversaries. A safer custody hotline number, where family and friends could leave messages if they had any concerns, was checked several times each day.

- I.24** Twenty-eight assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm were opened in the previous six months compared with 10 at our last inspection, which was relatively high for an open prison. They were often open for only a short period of time. The ACCT process was used to ensure men whose mood was low were supported before concerns escalated and prisoners received a good level of care. Documents were good and assessments were thorough. The healthcare department provided input when necessary. A quality assurance process had been established for the documents and outcomes were discussed at the safer custody meeting.
- I.25** The Listener scheme was well used and received up to 10 calls a week. During our inspection, there were 11 Listeners. More men in our survey than in similar prisons and compared with the last inspection said they could access the scheme at any time and Listeners ran a Sunday afternoon drop-in service in the Listener suite. The Samaritans held fortnightly meeting with Listeners to offer support. Samaritans phones were not available in every unit and just one was in North unit. However, men could call the Samaritans, free of charge, using their own phone credit system.
- I.26** A new national suicide and self-harm training package had been launched in May. A clear training plan was in place, although at the time of our inspection the majority of staff had not received any training.

Recommendation

- I.27 All staff should receive suicide and self-harm training.**

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.28** The governing governor sat on the local safeguarding adults board. A safeguarding adults policy was in place but not all staff were aware of it. Online training was available for staff and some in the offender management unit (OMU) had undertaken specialised training.
- I.29** The safer custody and healthcare teams had a complex needs register for prisoners identified as having adult social care needs. It allowed them to track referrals to and responses from adult social care. Men were assigned 'buddies' to assist them where appropriate. Men at risk were considered for a single room and a log documented the reason for allocating them one.
- I.30** There were links with Age UK to provide men with support and the local authority commissioned an advocacy service to assist prisoners when necessary.

Recommendation

- I.31 Appropriate safeguarding training should be available to all staff.**

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

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.

- I.32** Security arrangements were proportionate and focused on the identified risks faced by the establishment, which included the supply of drugs and illicit items, such as mobile phones, and the risk of prisoners absconding. The prison's ethos was to provide prisoners coming from closed conditions with a supportive environment and we saw prisoners receiving good support. Efforts were made to ensure any risks prisoners posed were managed proportionately and good dynamic security supported them.
- I.33** Intelligence was analysed and tested well and used to inform and develop the prison's response to emerging threats. Too many requests for targeted room searches and suspicion drug tests were not processed. A police intelligence officer was part of the security team and provided support and information to help manage risks.
- I.34** There had been a steady decrease in prisoners absconding with only four incidents in the previous six months. All those who had absconded and had returned to custody were interviewed to find out why they had absconded and to determine if any lessons could be learned. Over the same period, 57 prisoners had returned to closed conditions, fewer than at our last inspection.
- I.35** Prisoners who displayed risky behaviour were subject to an immediate suitability review (ISR) to determine whether they could stay in open conditions. Well-organised, appropriately managed suitability and monitoring (SAM) meetings were held every week for prisoners for whom security information suggested an increased but not immediate risk. Meetings, which were multidisciplinary, assessed whether their access to release on temporary licence (ROTL) and work should be reviewed and temporarily restricted or suspended, or if they should be returned to closed conditions. Despite some prisoners' perceptions, the prison made every effort to keep prisoners in open conditions and 60% of those subject to an immediate suitability review stayed at North Sea Camp because the prison only returned them to closed conditions when there was clear evidence of an unacceptable risk or following serious disciplinary incidents.
- I.36** The mandatory drug testing (MDT) targets of 5% of the population per month were in line with agreed standards and the local drug strategy. Tests took place proportionately throughout each month, including on weekends. The testing suite was adequate and had sufficient staff. Records were legible and well maintained. Over the previous six months, approximately 6% of mandatory tests were recorded as positive against the agreed 8.5% threshold. Since September 2016 there had been three positive MDT results for the use of new psychoactive substances (new drugs that are developed or chosen to mimic the effects of illegal drugs such as cannabis, heroin or amphetamines and may have unpredictable and life threatening effects).
- I.37** The availability of illicit drugs was relatively low and 24% of prisoners said it was easy to obtain illegal drugs, against 37% in the comparator and 42% at the last inspection. Intelligence-led testing did not take place consistently, although information-sharing between substance misuse services and the security and health care departments was good, and we were advised that spot checks of in-possession medication occurred routinely.

Good practice

- I.38** *The ISR and SAM meetings ensured that prisoners were kept safe and that those who presented an immediate or increased risk received appropriate support.*

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.

- I.39** All prisoners arriving at North Sea Camp were placed on the enhanced level of the IEP scheme in recognition of their transfer from closed to open conditions. During our inspection only six prisoners were on the standard level of the scheme and none were on the basic regime. The opportunity to remain in open conditions and apply for ROTL provided prisoners with the main incentive to behave well.
- I.40** Prisoners on the basic level – only one in the previous six months – were expected to stay on the level for 28 days despite receiving a review every seven days, even if their behaviour had improved, which was excessive.
- I.41** Prisoners appropriately received warnings for minor infringements of the rules and most men could appeal warnings or review board decisions. Prisoners on the enhanced level who were transferred to closed conditions because of poor behaviour were, however, denied the chance to attend a review board or make any representations. When we examined a sample of IEP review paperwork they demonstrated well-documented and fair decision-making.

Recommendations

- I.42** **Prisoners should be removed from the basic level following a review if no further poor behaviour is observed.**
- I.43** **Prisoners on the enhanced level who are returned to closed conditions due to poor behaviour should have the opportunity to attend a review board or make a representation to it.**

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.

Disciplinary procedures

- I.44** The number of adjudications was low. Most were for positive MDT results, possession of unauthorised articles or failing to comply with licence conditions. The adjudications we observed and adjudication records we saw demonstrated a detailed level of enquiry and prisoner involvement in the process. Hearings were conducted fairly.

- I.45** The deputy governor reviewed around 10% of all adjudications, and two standardisation meetings held in the previous 10 months had reviewed statistical data and considered the tariff awards for individual charges. There was no evidence to suggest that prisoners were returned to closed conditions purely because of a proven adjudication.

The use of force

- I.46** Use of force was very low. It had been used once in the year up to the inspection, when handcuffs were applied while a prisoner was escorted to another unit. A quarterly use of force review was carried out to ensure compliance with Prison Service orders and to scrutinise any use of force.

Segregation

- I.47** The prison continued to manage well without a segregation unit. When prisoners' behaviour warranted them being placed in a segregation unit, they were returned to closed conditions.

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.

- I.48** Managers, staff and substance misuse workers in the prison had developed, and were committed to, a comprehensive drug strategy. Key goals agreed as part of the strategy informed practice and we saw evidence of effective partnership working. The drug strategy meeting monitored action to ensure it was implemented.
- I.49** On arrival at the prison, the health screening considered potential drug and alcohol concerns and peer workers met with all men on the induction wing to provide advice about the services available. Addaction, the substance misuse service provider, assessed and supported men through a small team of committed and skilled practitioners and men we spoke to valued their contribution. An appropriate range of psychosocial interventions was provided through individual and group-based sessions. Fifty-four men were receiving support and we considered that the input provided was impressive.
- I.50** The service was well promoted and information was clear and accessible. Men were encouraged to use services without fear of recrimination. The department was open and accessible, enabling prisoners to seek peer and professional support. As well as referring themselves, men could be referred by staff in other departments or following a positive MDT result. The provision focused on recovery and included programmes dealing with misuse of alcohol and other substances. In addition, Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous led regular group sessions. Peer workers ran a number of social and therapeutic activities, including innovative music workshops.
- I.51** There were close links with the OMU and most prisoners in our survey and all prisoners we spoke to said they had received support with drug and alcohol problems when they required it. Care plans were good and we found evidence of detailed one-to-one work.
- I.52** Addaction also provided clinical substance misuse services. The prison had access to a specialist nurse practitioner from Lincoln prison and routine reviews were established. Demand was low and only four prisoners required opiate substitution treatment during the

inspection. Treatment options were flexible and focused on optimising patient outcomes. Good joint working took place. This included regular liaison with primary care services and joint case management with the mental health team.

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 The grounds were attractive, well maintained and enhanced the physical environment significantly. Most rooms and all communal areas were clean and men took pride in their surroundings. The standard of cleanliness was impressive. We saw no graffiti or rubbish.
- 2.2 Most of the accommodation, apart from the Jubilee units, was poor, old and cramped. The rooms in the North unit were particularly small and men had no chairs or desk space and little storage. Efforts had been made to reduce crowding in the dormitories in the South unit but some rooms still held too many men and provided little privacy. The Jubilee units consisted of four refurbished houses that aimed to replicate shared housing in the community and provided good progression opportunities for up to 66 men.
- 2.3 Many men, particularly those who had served many years living in a single cell in other establishments, found sharing a room difficult. Rooms were allocated fairly, but as there were few single rooms and they were in high demand, men could wait up to 11 months to be allocated one of them. Men had keys to their rooms, which they appreciated, but not all had a key to a safe in their room. Across the prison, storage facilities and furniture were largely inadequate. Many cupboards did not have doors, so possessions were on display.
- 2.4 Access to toilets and showers was good and the men kept them clean. However, some of the facilities were in poor repair and leaking, which was unpleasant.
- 2.5 Access to essential items and prison kit was reasonably good. Men working on the prison farm could change work wear items everyday if necessary. Prison clothing was easily available, but men could wear their own clothes.
- 2.6 There was one laundry, but men did not have direct access to it. They were entitled to one general wash a week and could pay for an additional wash. Many men felt the general wash was inadequate. We saw men hand washing items and hanging them on the unit washing lines. Cleaning material was available from wing cleaners.
- 2.7 The application process had improved since our last inspection. In our survey, 83% of men said applications were dealt with fairly, more than the comparator and compared with the last inspection, and applications were tracked. Prisoners' property was stored and recorded properly and men could apply to have access to it or arrange for property they did not need to be given to their families during a visit. We observed men obtaining their property easily at reception.
- 2.8 The phones were accessible, but they were in corridors and association rooms, so there was little privacy, and the few that were in booths were not sufficiently private. Letters and 'email a prisoner' processes worked well.
- 2.9 Not all notice boards around the prison contained up-to-date information but the boards in units were generally well maintained and relevant. North unit corridor had a large TV screen that provided useful information about prison life. The peer-run prisoner advice centre

provided useful information, forms and leaflets. It had dealt with over 2,000 queries in the six months prior to the inspection.

Recommendation

- 2.10 All showers and toilets should be in a reasonable state of repair and suitable for use.**

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.

- 2.11** In our survey, 93% of men said most staff treated them with respect, more than at comparator prisons (80%) and compared with our last inspection (80%). Staff-prisoner relationships were strong. We observed good, supportive relationships across the prison. Many men spoke highly of the staff and all told us that staff were approachable.
- 2.12** In our survey, 89% of men said they had a personal officer. Unit officers were responsible for 15-20 men and most knew the men in their care well. Men knew who their personal officers were and most told us they saw them often enough. However, records on P-Nomis (the Prison Service IT system) outlining personal officer contact were variable. While some showed real engagement, others demonstrated that contact was not frequent enough or too brief or they repeated the same information month after month.
- 2.13** Consultation was reasonably good and developing. Many departments had their own consultation forums and the prison had many prisoner representatives and mentors. Several new initiatives provided prisoners with good opportunities to become involved. They included News Night, a monthly information and question and answer session where senior staff were available to discuss issues with the men, and the prisoner representative group, a meeting where unit representatives took concerns to the heads of functions.
- 2.14** Staff responded to queries raised, but more analysis of long-term and systemic difficulties would have made consultation processes more relevant and effective. The newly established monthly prison newspaper *North Sea News* was also a good source of information and promoted dialogue.

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 characteristic⁴ 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.

Strategic management

- 2.15** Equality and diversity work had been relaunched in January 2017. An up-to-date local equality policy explained the new approach, which involved nominated senior managers forming a small team. It included a probation officer and prisoner representatives who managed a specific protected characteristic group. The system was promising, because it gave prisoners responsibility and established a ‘whole-prison’ approach. Notices around the prison had photographs of the team members. However, the initiative was not yet embedded across all the protected characteristic groups.
- 2.16** The equalities action team (EAT) now met bimonthly and was chaired by the governor or her deputy. An equality action plan had been prepared in March 2017 and was beginning to drive business at the meetings.
- 2.17** An equalities manager coordinated a group of equalities peer mentors. They worked in the equalities hub, providing prisoners with an excellent source of support and advice. Men could also speak to prisoner equalities representatives in the residential units. Working together, the two groups of prisoners either resolved or escalated concerns. The mentors used a stand-alone computer to keep records of all the issues raised and produced a briefing for each EAT meeting.
- 2.18** There had been no systematic monitoring of equality data for at least six months because of a problem with a national reporting system. This meant we could not be confident that processes were fair. We identified that in the six months prior to our inspection a disproportionate number of Muslim prisoners had been returned to closed conditions. In addition, our survey suggested that gay men were more likely than others to live in the Jubilee units. Managers were not aware of these facts and had not conducted any investigations to assess processes for bias.
- 2.19** In the six months prior to our inspection, prisoners had submitted nine discrimination incident reporting forms. They had been investigated well, but some responses had been delayed.
- 2.20** On arrival, all men were asked to complete a confidential equality questionnaire, which initiated various processes, including individual meetings with the equalities manager.

⁴ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

Recommendation

- 2.21** Equality monitoring data and prisoners' views should be analysed routinely to help managers identify and investigate areas of possible discrimination.

Good practice

- 2.22** *The involvement of probation officers in work to support protected characteristic groups was a novel way to encourage a 'whole-prison' approach and it promoted confidence in equality management.*

Protected characteristics

- 2.23** In our survey, black and minority ethnic men were more negative than white men in a few areas, including victimisation and being treated with respect. Although we could not find evidence of adverse outcomes, their perceptions needed exploring further. In the six months prior to our inspection no specific forums were held to gather the views of black and minority ethnic men. However, events such as Black History Month and Holocaust Memorial Day were routinely marked. The Gypsy, Romany and Traveller community had appreciated plans for a celebration meal, but it had not been authentic, which caused disappointment.
- 2.24** Foreign national prisoners and those with close family abroad could have a free five-minute phone call once a month, but only if they had not received a visit that month. Translation and interpretation services were not required as all foreign national prisoners spoke English.
- 2.25** A few Muslim prisoners said they were victimised by other prisoners. We saw an incident during which insulting language was used against a Muslim prisoner and we were impressed with the way prisoners and staff supported the victim.
- 2.26** We did not find any men with unidentified needs relating to a disability, but sometimes it was difficult for staff to meet these needs. We met and heard about men who found it difficult to get around the site and some struggled to secure appropriate employment. Not all buildings were fully accessible, and the healthcare department was a significant walk up a steep slope. Prisoners had conducted a site survey in March 2017 and several adaptations had been requested. Some men with disabilities were embarrassed by having to share a room. Men with disabilities were more negative than others in our survey, particularly about safety and victimisation.
- 2.27** Prisoners who needed it were given a key to an adapted shower in the North unit, which was clean but smelly due to a problem with the drain (see recommendation 2.10). Personal emergency evacuation plans were in place for those who needed them. They were reviewed regularly and included up-to-date information about nominated prisoner buddies who would assist in an emergency. Some men also had buddies to help them with everyday tasks, except for personal care. We expected to see individual care plans, but none existed and in a few cases neither buddies nor prison staff were clear what support was necessary for each man.
- 2.28** The policy for managing transgender prisoners was reasonable and several staff had received appropriate training. Some gay and bisexual men felt it was safe to be open about their sexuality. They ran a discussion forum every month. Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender awareness events were held regularly and there were plans for a Pride event in August 2017. Despite this positive approach, some men told us they had to endure inappropriate comments from other prisoners.

- 2.29** There were separate prisoner representatives for younger, middle-aged and older men. A drop-in session for younger men had led to a plan for a charity cycle ride. Middle-aged men had asked for an over-40s gym session and could attend a session previously reserved for men aged 50 and over for a trial period.
- 2.30** There were now 150 men aged over 50, a 50% increase since July 2016. Older men spoke positively about the activity sessions run by gym and equality staff. They were particularly useful for men who might otherwise have spent nearly all day in their room because they were retired or unfit for work. However, they only happened twice a week and did not take place during our inspection. The policy document for older prisoners was not based on a needs assessment and we thought some older men, particularly those with disabilities, needed more support. Those who were retired or unfit for work could receive up to £9 a week, which we considered sufficient.
- 2.31** A peer-led veterans' forum took place every month and several veteran community groups were involved regularly and provided resettlement support.

Recommendation

- 2.32** **The prison should assess the needs of less able and older men and implement a strategy to meet their needs, which should include physical adaptations where necessary.**

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.

- 2.33** The Free Church managing chaplain had only been in post since April 2017. Before that his post had been vacant for six months. Two part-time positions were also vacant. A Muslim chaplain was due to start work in September 2017, but an Anglican chaplain had still not been found. A broad range of sessional staff worked flexibly to meet the needs of most faith groups.
- 2.34** Most men were positive about faith provision. Chaplains welcomed prisoners individually on arrival and saw them again during the induction programme.
- 2.35** The chapel was dated but adequate. It was open all day, staffed by a team of prison orderlies who offered hospitality and support. The chapel was used for discussion groups and recreational events. The multi-faith room was small, but adequate, although washing facilities required refurbishment. Men had good access to corporate worship.
- 2.36** Each faith group was encouraged to celebrate major festivals with a meal provided by the catering staff. Muslim prisoners spoke positively about Ramadan.
- 2.37** Chaplains provided good pastoral support, visiting those who were unwell every day and seeing those on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm at least once a week. Support for bereaved men was strong. There was only one prison visitor, which was insufficient.

- 2.38** The chaplain was working with others in the region to develop a directory of community faith organisations keen to work with ex-offenders.

Recommendation

- 2.39** The washing facilities in the multi-faith room should be refurbished.

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.

- 2.40** There had been 290 complaints in the previous six months, fewer than in a similar period in 2016, but still high, suggesting that prisoners were not afraid to complain. Prisoners mostly complained about the offender management unit (OMU) and the management of property on transfer. Managers had recognised that many issues could have been resolved less formally and had set up clinics for complaints about the OMU.
- 2.41** Responses to complaints had improved markedly since March 2017, as a result of a 20% random quality assurance exercise, which provided managers with regular feedback. Most replies were now at least reasonable, but managers still often failed to meet with the prisoner. Except for complaints involving other establishments, all were answered promptly.
- 2.42** Managers now analysed basic complaints data every month but did not monitor complaints against staff, confidential access complaints (which are about staff or are particularly sensitive or personal) or those with an alleged discriminatory element more closely to ensure that those that were the most serious were appropriately handled. (See also paragraph 2.18).

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.

- 2.43** In our survey, prisoners were less positive than at our previous inspection about their ability to communicate with their legal representative. We found no significant difference in the provision at this inspection and concluded that changes in access to legal aid might have been a factor. Legal visits were still not sufficiently private because several took place at once in the main visits room.

Recommendation

- 2.44** Legal visits should take place in sufficient privacy. (Repeated recommendation 2.53)

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.

2.45 The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)⁵ and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies. The CQC found there were no breaches of the relevant regulations.

Governance arrangements

2.46 Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust provided primary physical and mental health services. There was no on site dental provision but patients were registered at Boston Dental Centre.

2.47 A health needs analysis, generated in 2015, informed service delivery. NHS England carried out performance monitoring effectively and held quarterly contract monitoring meetings. A partnership board met quarterly and included senior prison staff, commissioners and clinical staff.

2.48 Clinical governance arrangements were sound and relationships with prison staff were good. Quality assurance and local auditing systems looked at areas such as infection control and clinical records. Regular staff meetings were held to discuss concerns and ensure any relevant remedial action was taken. Reporting systems and the dissemination of lessons learned from serious adverse incidents were good. No patient representatives or health forums had been established to address collective concerns, although written feedback was sought and evaluated.

2.49 The healthcare leadership team had only recently been appointed, but managerial oversight was good. There was a small number of staff vacancies, and workforce plans were being effectively progressed. Training and supervision was good and access to professional development programmes ensured specialist skills were being developed in-house.

2.50 Systems were in place to prevent communicable diseases and manage outbreaks. Policies on information governance were appropriate and staff were appropriately trained. The small healthcare centre was clean and all clinical rooms were suitable and complied with infection prevention standards.

2.51 The single emergency bag kept in the healthcare centre was checked regularly, although there was no inventory and we found two items that had expired. Automated external defibrillators were strategically located and regularly checked. Sufficient prison staff were trained in first aid and all staff we spoke to understood how to respond to medical emergencies. External emergency services generally responded promptly.

2.52 Prisoners received good healthcare information. A new leadership team had improved the way healthcare complaints were managed. Some areas still required development, such as

⁵ CQC is the independent regulator of health and adult social care in England. It monitors, inspects and regulates services to make sure they meet fundamental standards of quality and safety. For information on CQC's standards of care and the action it takes to improve services, please visit: <http://www.cqc.org.uk>.

quality assurance and monitoring of trends, but the introduction of face-to-face management clinics was positive.

- 2.53** All prisoners were offered chlamydia, hepatitis B, hepatitis C and HIV screening on arrival at the prison. An appropriate range of immunisations were also offered, although a shortage of hepatitis B vaccines had led to longer waiting times. Men were provided with condoms on request.
- 2.54** A good range of health promotion literature was displayed in the waiting area. Age-related health screenings were available, as were a smoking cessation service and weight management advice clinics. Waiting times for these clinics were short and patients were positive about them. Healthcare staff had developed a calendar of health promotion events, which included national campaigns such as Stoptober (promoting smoking cessation) and Movember (raising prostate and testicular cancer awareness). A healthcare open day was planned to encourage prisoners and healthcare staff to interact more openly.

Recommendation

- 2.55** **A representative health forum should be set up to inform service developments and enable collective concerns to be addressed.**

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.56** No receptions were received during the inspection, but facilities were adequate and included access to SystemOne (the electronic clinical information system). The records we reviewed showed that initial screening and follow-up appointments took place appropriately.
- 2.57** The healthcare centre was open between 7.15am and 6.15pm and patients had open access to the facility. Most appointments were made face-to-face at the healthcare centre reception, although written applications could also be made. There was no out-of-hours' provision and prison staff would call 111 or 999 if medical assistance was required.
- 2.58** A small number of patients had mobility problems and a prisoner buddy system enabled these men to access the healthcare centre. However, patients occasionally missed appointments as they were too infirm to visit the building and we were advised that consultations could be carried out in-cell if necessary. Telephone interpreting services were available and printed literature in alternative formats or languages could be produced on request.
- 2.59** Waiting times for most services were equivalent to, or better than, those in the community. A local GP practice provided three clinics per week and men waited up to 10 days for a routine appointment, although urgent slots were available at each clinic. GPs could also complete some tasks remotely, such as prescriptions, which helped them manage their workload while on site. The waiting time to see the nurse was one to two days. We found a wait of 11 to 12 weeks to see the podiatrist, which was too long, and routine podiatry appointments were often delayed to allow urgent cases to be seen.
- 2.60** The prison had an appropriate range of accessible, nurse-led clinics, in areas such as sexual health and immunisation, and offered ad hoc services, for example, wound care. Nurses received appropriate training and support to manage their workload and each nurse had developed skills in a particular long-term condition, such as asthma or diabetes. Patients were appropriately reviewed, but care planning was underdeveloped. The rate for non-attendance at clinics was low and there was a robust system for managing and chasing

external hospital referrals because positive relationships had been formed with local hospitals.

Recommendation

2.61 Access to podiatry services should be equivalent to community provision.

Pharmacy

- 2.62** Individually labelled medicines were dispensed from Wells Cooperative Pharmacy. Prescriptions were issued by GPs, who were on site three days a week, although they could deal with requests electronically from their community location. The area clinical pharmacist oversaw medicines management practice. Pharmacy technicians were on site every day and coordinated the ordering of medicines. Excessive stock was held on site, but plans were in place to reduce it. New prescriptions were generally available within two days, although we were told they could be available on the day of prescribing in urgent cases. Arrangements for moving and storing medicines were adequate, but those for reconciling unused medicines were not and disposals were not fully accounted for. There was no audit trail for the controlled drug key.
- 2.63** There was an appropriate range of standard operating policies, but staff had only recently signed them to confirm they had read them. Patient group directions (which enable nurses to supply and administer prescription-only medicine) gave men access to vaccinations. Nurses could provide simple remedies for most common conditions from a general supply list and pharmacy clinics were available so patients could discuss medication issues.
- 2.64** Medicines were administered twice a day starting at 7.30am from a single location in the healthcare centre. Men also attended the centre to collect their in-possession medication and report 'sick-in-cell'. This meant over 20 men could be in the waiting area. Patients we spoke to complained about the inflexibility of collection arrangements, the congestion and a lack of privacy. Although a mobile screen was used, there was very limited scope for confidentiality and officers did not supervise the area. Evening medicine administration occurred from 5pm onwards. However, at weekends there was no evening medicine round, which meant supervised medicines were given to men in-possession, earlier in the day.
- 2.65** Most patients received medication in-possession. Only 4.2% of patients had a completed risk assessment that formally considered both the patient and their drug risk. Despite there being limited evidence that the diversion of prescribed medicines was a major issue in the prison, this gap in governance posed a significant risk.
- 2.66** The ambient temperature in the pharmacy room and fridge temperatures were appropriately monitored and the environment was suitable. Pharmacy staff and nurse managers in the prison considered medicine management arrangements as part of the trust's drugs and therapeutics committee.

Recommendations

- 2.67 Adequate arrangements for reconciling and disposing of unused medicines should be in place.**
- 2.68 Patients should receive medicine confidentially and officers should oversee supervised medicines.**
- 2.69 Medications not given in possession should be administered as clinically indicated and documented risk assessments should be completed before in-possession medication is considered and recorded on SystemOne.**

Dentistry

- 2.70** Dentistry was not provided at the prison and patients could wait up to three months for a routine community appointment, which was too long. Many people told us they were frustrated about the long wait to see the dentist and having to manage their discomfort. There were insufficient officer escorts to meet the demand for external dental appointments and if a patient was delayed at the dental clinic, appointments planned for later in the day had to be rescheduled.
- 2.71** Discussions were ongoing about commissioning a domiciliary dental service to clear the backlog of appointments. NHS England fund all health care escorts activity retrospectively (both dental and other secondary care related appointments) and are in discussions to potentially fund detailed officers ring-fenced to provide dedicated health care and dental escort provision. This will increase escort availability and allow more prisoners to attend timely dental and health care appointments.

Recommendation

- 2.72 Patients should have access to dental assessment and NHS treatments in line with community provision.**

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.73** Mental health services in the prison were delivered five days a week through a stepped care model using a psychologically led approach covering mild to moderate problems. It included guided self-help, group work and a range of individual psychological therapies, although prisoners had to wait for over 40 weeks for counselling services. A nurse manager worked across North Sea Camp and Lincoln prisons. Two full-time registered mental health nurses undertook initial triage and assessed men's needs. Very few men had severe and enduring mental ill-health, but two prisoners were subject to the care programme approach (CPA) and received specialist secondary mental health support. A range of sessional professional staff supported the pathway, including a psychiatrist, psychologists and therapy staff.
- 2.74** Prison staff and healthcare practitioners could refer prisoners or men could refer themselves. The system was flexible and men could call into the department for advice or to seek help formally. The clinical records we examined were good and appropriate professional development and supervision arrangements were in place. Most men receiving support were experiencing anxiety or minor depressive symptoms and required input so they could manage the transition to open conditions and prepare to move back into the

community. We found that men's needs were being met, although there was no dedicated administrative support, which added to the workload of full-time staff.

- 2.75** The service liaised well with prison personnel, other general health practitioners and the substance misuse team. Any prisoner in crisis was offered support and we saw the nursing team contribute effectively to ACCT case reviews. Custody staff had received mental health awareness training as a module in the package of safeguarding adult training being delivered to all staff.
- 2.76** None of the men had been identified as requiring treatment in hospital under the Mental Health Act in the previous 12 months.

Recommendation

- 2.77 Patients requiring counselling support should have access to appropriate services.**

Social care

- 2.78** A memorandum of understanding was in place between the prison, the local authority and the social care provider and referrals for social care assessments were made to Lincolnshire County Council. None of the prisoners was receiving social care at the time of the inspection. The lead social worker had initiated a monthly drop-in clinic to increase the profile and understanding of social care. Referrals were assessed promptly and the healthcare provider and lead social worker were satisfied that there were no unmet needs. Good partnership working took place.
- 2.79** Healthcare or prison staff could refer a prisoner for a social care assessment, or they could refer themselves. A social care screening was built into the healthcare reception process. Information available across the prison explained the application process and the eligibility criteria. Referrals were appropriately made to community services if anyone required mobility or specialist medical equipment. A small number of cells had been adapted for single occupancy to accommodate people with medical needs, but they could only provide individuals with a medical disability with limited support.

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.

- 2.80** In our survey, 87% of prisoners said the food was good or very good compared with 37% in similar prisons. The food we tasted was excellent, as were portion sizes. Catering staff were provided with some produce from the prison farm. There was a five-week menu cycle that changed seasonally and the kitchen met the needs of all prisoners with special dietary requirements. Themed monthly meals continued to be provided and religious celebrations took place for all religions. Muslim prisoners were positive about the recent Ramadan provision.
- 2.81** The main kitchen was small but clean and the servery area was well supervised at meal times. All prisoners could eat together and meals were served directly from the kitchen servery.

- 2.82** Those in the Jubilee units could cater for themselves and received £14 per week to buy food. Prisoners we spoke to were positive about the help they received to practise living independently. There were no self-catering facilities in other units, although microwaves had just been purchased and hot water was available throughout the day.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.83** In our survey, more respondents than at similar prisons and compared to the last inspection said that the shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs. Black and minority ethnic prisoners were less positive than white prisoners, however. The prison shop list was updated at least quarterly after prisoners were consulted and now included a full range of religious items that were not available at the last inspection.
- 2.84** Prisoners who arrived from other prisons had a choice of initial reception packs (typically containing items such as biscuits, sweets and orange juice) and could order additional packs until they could make a full canteen order. Men who arrived at the prison without enough of their property could have clothes sent in from their families or order from a catalogue for 56 days after reception. A local charity also ran a second-hand clothing store, which men appreciated.
- 2.85** Goods were distributed efficiently. Prisoners who worked outside the prison or who were on release on temporary licence could authorise another prisoner to collect their goods on their behalf. A two-weekly drop-in had been introduced so prisoners could raise queries about all aspects of finance and canteen.
- 2.86** Prisoners could order newspapers and goods from catalogues but were charged an administration fee.

Good practice

- 2.87** *The drop-in enabled prisoners to resolve financial and canteen queries promptly.*

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.⁶

- 3.1** Men were never locked up and had their own keys, which promoted independence and responsibility. There were regular roll checks throughout the day and men were familiar with the regime and understood when they needed to be in their units. After 8pm, men had to return to their unit area but could still use the toilets and showers.
- 3.2** Efforts had been made to brighten up association rooms and while they all had games equipment, not all of it was in good repair. The association rooms in Harrison and Llewellyn units were well used, but very few men could be there at any one time because there were not enough seats or space. The association room in South 1 was also used for induction sessions and by men from South 2, so it was busy (see paragraph 1.8). A good range of social and recreational activities was provided in the evenings and at weekends, many of them organised by the men. They included sport, music and regular fundraising events for charities. The grounds had seating areas and men appreciated the opportunity to be outside to socialise or exercise.

Recommendation

- 3.3 The space for association should be increased and rooms should be properly equipped.**

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

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

Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work: Good

Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work: Good

Quality of learning and skills and work provision, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment: Good

Personal development and behaviour: Good

Leadership and management of learning and skills and work: Good

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.5** The strategic leadership of learning and skills and work was good. Senior managers had recently introduced several useful strategies for improving the range of the provision. They had worked strenuously to identify external partners, so they could introduce a wider range of employment and work experience opportunities and improve the availability of vocational qualifications. Despite working well with employers, it was disappointing that relatively few prisoners regularly worked outside the prison. During the inspection only 21 men were working outside the prison under release on temporary licence (ROTL), two of whom were being paid.
- 3.6** Senior managers ensured that prisoners attended their planned activities. While attendance at education was satisfactory, in workshops and work it was very high. Prisoners' attendance at essential appointments did not adversely affect work or education sessions.
- 3.7** The education and training provided by Novus was good. The education manager had applied performance management procedures effectively. As a result, outcomes for prisoners on almost all courses were very high. Further improvement was still required on some maths courses. Observations of teaching, learning and assessment were used effectively to support staff training and development and maintain the provision's good quality.
- 3.8** Senior leaders and managers had successfully introduced vocational training pathways. They were used to help prisoners identify appropriate learning and skills activities that supported their long-term career aspirations.

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

- 3.9 Senior leaders and managers had completed a useful offender needs analysis, which they were using to inform a detailed curriculum review. They had used the initial results of the analysis to identify deficits in the current education, training and work provision.
- 3.10 Staff did not sufficiently analyse or use available data to monitor the quality of the provision or plan further improvements. Managers had to examine original data during the inspection before they could respond to inspectors' queries.
- 3.11 The most recent self-assessment report was reasonably accurate, but did not give sufficient weight to several areas that inspectors had identified as requiring improvement.

Recommendations

- 3.12 **Relationships with employers and other external agencies should be further improved to increase the proportion of prisoners who work outside the prison.**
- 3.13 **All staff should analyse and make good use of data to improve the quality of the provision and measure the impact of their actions.**

Provision of activities

- 3.14 The prison provided 440 activity places, almost all full-time, which was sufficient for all prisoners. The allocations process efficiently matched prisoners to activities that reflected their skills action plans. The plans focused on activities that supported their skills and future employability.
- 3.15 The range of education courses offered by Novus across the academic year adequately met prisoners' needs, except for those of men who had significant prior attainments. Not all courses were delivered throughout the year and the education manager kept a short waiting list. Prisoners could attend courses from entry level to level 2 in English, maths, information technology (IT) and business venture. A small number of discrete employability courses were offered. Courses in cookery, personal finance and budget management were available to help prisoners develop relevant life skills to support their resettlement plans.
- 3.16 The range of accredited vocational training had increased since the previous inspection and included performing manufacturing operations, horticulture, painting and decorating, bricklaying and bicycle maintenance. A growing number of courses were at level 2. A small number of prisoners worked in areas without having received accredited training. As a result, prison managers planned to introduce new work-based courses, including catering and customer service. A minority of prisoners in workshops had begun working towards accredited employment qualifications and a few, who were working as mentors, had achieved a level 3 qualification in information, advice and guidance. Forty-two learners were undertaking a range of Open University and other distance learning courses.
- 3.17 Work was available in the lobster pot and recycling workshops, in the laundry and kitchens and on the prison farm. Work settings provided a realistic working environment and employed over 200 prisoners. Some wing jobs, however, did not offer enough work to fill the working day.

Recommendations

- 3.18** The prison should introduce a greater number and range of functional skills and employability courses to meet the resettlement needs of the population.
- 3.19** The level and range of the education and training provision should be extended to meet the needs of those with higher prior academic attainment.

Quality of provision

- 3.20** Teaching, learning and assessment were good. Induction and initial assessment were effective and ensured prisoners were promptly allocated to an appropriate activity. Teachers made good use of the outcomes of initial assessment to plan group learning in education. However, a small number of instructors in work areas did not use the information sufficiently well to integrate English and maths skills support in work settings.
- 3.21** Enthusiastic tutors, instructors and peer mentors provided good learning support that helped prisoners raise their achievements. Learning was well planned and enabled men to develop appropriate knowledge and skills as well as an understanding of relevant topics.
- 3.22** Additional learning support had been extended since the previous inspection and was very effective and those receiving it gained appropriate qualifications and relevant skills. College staff carried out a detailed assessment of prisoners' barriers to learning and ensured that those who needed extra help received it. Teachers and instructors managed prisoner peer mentors effectively enabling them to support learners appropriately.
- 3.23** In education, targets were set and learners' progress was monitored well. Teachers kept detailed records of men's progress against learning targets, learners progressed quickly in their studies and most course success rates were very high. Instructors on vocational courses had high expectations, especially of those working on the farm. Instructors ensured that prisoners worked to commercial standards.
- 3.24** Tutors and instructors provided learners with good oral and written feedback that encouraged them to improve and produce work of a high standard.
- 3.25** In education, teachers routinely corrected errors and regularly emphasised the importance of accurate English and maths in the workplace. In work areas, a few instructors did not sufficiently provide prisoners with guidance on their use of English, promote maths skills, or set targets to improve their personal skills to improve their employability.
- 3.26** Vocational training workshops were well equipped, particularly the farm and the brickwork workshop. However, insufficient computing resources were available in education and training to support individual learning styles. Managers had recently resolved longstanding infrastructure problems that had prevented prisoners from using the virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities). However, staff training was required before prisoners could start using the resource.
- 3.27** Teachers promoted equality and diversity well during lessons and skilfully guided group discussions on a range of potentially sensitive topics such as sexuality, race and gender reassignment.

Recommendations

- 3.28** The integration of English and maths skills should be promoted in all work and training settings.
- 3.29** Prisoners should have access to sufficient computing facilities, including the virtual campus.

Personal development and behaviour

- 3.30** Prisoners' personal development and behaviour were good. Prisoners in work and vocational training developed useful employment skills. Learners were well behaved in classes and work settings and levels of mutual respect were high.
- 3.31** Attendance rates were good as was punctuality. The small number of absences due to authorised appointments did not interrupt learners' progress or inhibit the development of a good work ethic. Prisoners worked well in most areas.
- 3.32** Prisoners working towards vocational qualifications were keen to learn new skills and took pride in their achievements. For example, those in bricklaying typically arrived early for work and were keen to complete their projects.
- 3.33** Vocational training coursework encouraged learners to develop appropriate work-related English and maths skills. However, a minority of prisoners were working in prison workshops where accreditation was not available. Many of these prisoners also enjoyed their work, although few understood its relevance for their future career prospects.
- 3.34** Instructors focused well on health and safety. As a result, prisoners felt safe and demonstrated a good understanding of safe working practices in each work area.
- 3.35** Pre-release courses and activities while on ROTL allowed prisoners to improve their understanding of life in modern Britain.

Recommendation

- 3.36** The prison should ensure there are appropriate vocational training opportunities across all work settings.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.37** Educational and vocational achievements were good. Success rates on almost all education and vocational training courses were high. No gaps in achievement were identified between different groups of learners. Prisoners with learning difficulties or disabilities succeeded at least as well as their peers.
- 3.38** In 2015–16, success rates on functional skills English and a small number of IT courses required improvement. Success rates on mathematics courses, particularly at level 1, were low and required further improvement. They had improved on most courses in the months prior to the inspection. Education learners made good progress from entry level to level 1 courses, but few had progressed from level 1 to level 2 courses.

- 3.39** Learners in education and training made good progress and swiftly developed a range of useful employment-related, personal and social skills. Work in education and training sessions was good. Most prisoners in workshops worked well to meet production deadlines and developed a range of valuable employment skills.

Recommendation

- 3.40** **Immediate action should be taken to drive up success rates further on English and maths courses.**

Library

- 3.41** A librarian, supported by five prison orderlies, was responsible for running the library on a day-to-day basis. The library was well managed and offered an efficient service, ensuring all prisoners had easy access to a wide range of resources. It was well stocked and met the needs of the prison population. Prisoners' access to legal texts and to Prison Service orders and instructions was satisfactory. The rate of book loss was low.
- 3.42** Planned access to the library was excellent as the library was open seven days a week and a large proportion of prisoners were registered users. In our survey, more prisoners than the comparator said they visited the library more than once a week. All prisoners were also registered with the local library so that they could use it when on ROTL.
- 3.43** Library staff promoted the development of prisoners' reading skills through the Reading Plan and Six Book Challenge literacy schemes as well as the Storybook Dads initiative (in which prisoners record stories for their children).
- 3.44** Learners on distance learning courses used the computers available well to word process their academic assignments. However, they had no internet access to support academic research or apply for employment or training prior to release (see paragraph 3.26 and recommendation 3.29).

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.

- 3.45** Facilities were suitable and included a sports hall and separate weights and cardiovascular rooms. Much of the equipment had been replaced since the previous inspection and regular maintenance was carried out. Prisoners had adequate access to drinking water while using indoor facilities.
- 3.46** Induction to the gym was timely and appropriate. Healthy living was promoted sufficiently. Links with the health care department were good and ensured new arrivals with identified health conditions were reviewed swiftly.
- 3.47** The gym provided a good range of recreational and training opportunities, which prompted prisoners to make decisions about diet and exercise. Activities included specific sessions for prisoners over the age of 50 and retired prisoners.

- 3.48** The prison offered an appropriate range and number of vocational PE qualifications that met the population's needs. Staff were appropriately qualified and experienced.
- 3.49** Prisoners continued to participate effectively in arrangements to support a group of adults with learning disabilities who visited the prison each week for a PE session. A local charity provided indoor bowling events, which were popular with older prisoners.
- 3.50** The PE department was in an old part of the estate. Several maintenance issues required urgent attention. Changing and shower facilities were not private enough.

Recommendations

- 3.51 Senior managers should ensure all repairs and routine maintenance are carried out promptly.**
- 3.52 Senior managers should ensure showers and toilets have sufficient screening.**

Section 4. Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

Planning for a prisoner's release or transfer starts on their arrival at the prison.

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

Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.

- 4.1 The prison's purpose was to prepare prisoners for release, while managing the risks some of them posed to the public. The prison had effectively established a balance through careful and targeted use of release on temporary licence (ROTL). The offender management unit (OMU) was responsible for sentence progression and managing risk.
- 4.2 Many improvements had been made since the last inspection. Although there were still some minor issues to resolve, work to resettle prisoners was good. Most prisoners complied with sentence plans. The prison focused on managing those who had the potential to pose a high risk to others and who had served long sentences.
- 4.3 A range of up-to-date and comprehensive policies outlined how resettlement services were delivered. A new needs analysis had been completed, and provided some insight, however it did not include readily available information from offender assessment system (OASys) documents or basic custody screenings.
- 4.4 The prison had two heads of OMU, one took the lead for public protection and the other for offender management. They worked well together and understood areas of crossover. Supported by a knowledgeable senior probation officer, they led three OMU teams effectively. The teams directed the work of other departments, including the resettlement team, which implemented the decisions of the OMU.
- 4.5 Resettlement work started as soon as men arrived at North Sea Camp. Much of the work to prepare prisoners for release was undertaken using ROTL, which allowed offenders' risk management plans to be tested in the community before release. It also helped men prepare for their resettlement in the community by, for example, finding work or rebuilding links with their families. However, relatively little ROTL provision was available for prisoners working outside the prison (see paragraph 3.5). Nevertheless, the overall management of ROTL at North Sea Camp was good.
- 4.6 In the previous six months, there had been 5,709 ROTL events. Restricted ROTL, used for the highest risk prisoners had been approved for 902 men. Standard ROTL had been approved for 151 prisoners.
- 4.7 ROTL was linked to sentence plan objectives. Each episode of ROTL was carefully assessed, planned, monitored and reviewed. Information and views were sought from all key organisations and for those on restricted ROTL (for the highest risk prisoners), assessments were informed by an enhanced behavioural monitoring (EBM) assessment, which involved a psychologist working with the prisoner and staff to monitor and assess offence-related risks more effectively. Overall assessments were robust and enabled appropriate decisions to be made.
- 4.8 In the cases we reviewed, no adverse incidents had taken place during ROTL and the active management of risk seemed effective. In the previous six months, there had been three

minor incidents. In two cases the prisoner reported that they had breached their licence, in the third the prisoner could be seen by staff, but returned late. These instances were considered by the board and dealt with appropriately.

- 4.9** There was an average delay of two months from approval at the ROTL board to the first accompanied visit. Reasons for the delay included some of the board's recommendations failing to be approved in time and the limited availability of staff to accompany the prisoner. Although we saw some cases being prioritised if, for example, release was approaching, the prison did not monitor delays and it was not clear that all were justifiable. We received many complaints about this from prisoners.
- 4.10** The OMU did not oversee the allocation of prisoners to ROTL, which was made by individual request rather than according to a waiting list or the prisoner's release date. This meant some prisoners did not benefit from staged or progressive ROTL.
- 4.11** There was an apparent tension between the core function of the prison – to help prisoners return successfully to their communities – and the performance measures set by Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS). The prison was not credited for those prisoners employed under ROTL outside the confines of the prison. The governor was, appropriately, concerned to get as many men working under ROTL as possible but the performance targets were causing some concern.

Recommendations

- 4.12 The offending needs analysis should be informed by OASys and resettlement needs data.**
- 4.13 The allocation process for accompanied ROTL should be reviewed to ensure allocations are suitable. Prisoners should be informed of intended timescales.**
- 4.14 The prison should monitor delays at each stage of the ROTL process to ensure barriers to progress are minimised.**
- 4.15 HMPPS should amend their prisoner employment performance targets so that prisons facilitating the effective use of ROTL to promote employment skills are not disadvantaged.**

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.

- 4.16** Offender management was effective. The three casework teams had established good relationships with community offender managers enabling them to identify men's needs and risks and provide appropriate sentence progression. Offender supervisors could explain risks to community offender managers and how they might be presented in open conditions. Training was well embedded in the OMU.
- 4.17** OASys backlogs had decreased in the previous six months, because a senior probation officer had implemented an effective escalation process and the senior management team

carried out monitoring on a daily basis. Community offender managers were challenged when the OASys documents they were responsible for were late. The number and quality of OASys documents completed by the officer offender supervisors was monitored.

- 4.18 The narrative entries in offender supervisors' OASys documents we reviewed were good and showed time was being spent on this work. Assessments were informed by a wide range of information, including submissions from personal officers, which were detailed and helpful.
- 4.19 Sentence planning was relevant to prisoners' needs and appropriately had a ROTL focus (see paragraphs 4.5 to 4.11). In our survey, 87% of men said they had a sentence plan and 73% had been involved in its development. Men we spoke to knew what their sentence plan objectives were and how to achieve them.
- 4.20 Risks were underestimated in some non-violent offender cases; they were considered to have been a low risk without a full risk assessment having been undertaken. These included those convicted of offences such as the supply of class A drugs, which had received lengthy prison sentences. A full analysis should have taken place so that inherent risks could have been considered.
- 4.21 Despite effective risk management, too many OASys risk management plans did not reflect the prisoner's current situation or risk measures that would have been required to manage the individual on release. Plans did not always include risk measures for custody or the community. This area of work needed to be developed.
- 4.22 In some cases where the OASys had been completed by community offender managers the assessments had not been reviewed to reflect a move to open conditions. When this occurred offender supervisors chased up reviews.
- 4.23 The OMU aimed to have contact with prisoners every month, which was generally achieved. Most meetings were pre-arranged and the appointment recorded on P-Nomis (the Prison Service IT system). A detailed and often informative entry from the meeting was also recorded. Offender supervisor contact levels and the quality of contact was good.
- 4.24 We reviewed 10 home detention curfew (HDC) decisions. We found the process to have been thorough and decisions justifiable and based on a good range of information, including contributions from security staff and personal officers, as well as adjudications and police national computer details. Men attended a board and most were released on their eligibility date or within a couple of days of it. Where extra conditions were applied, they were appropriate. In one case, a governor had noticed a potential risk and asked a community offender manager if they needed an additional condition. The few HDC refusals were proportionate.

Recommendations

- 4.25 **Risk assessments should consider the inherent risks of all offending behaviour not just those that appear violent.**
- 4.26 **Risk management plans should be current and comprehensive covering risk management in open conditions and for release.**

Public protection

- 4.27** The prison had an appropriate focus on public protection. Staff had a good understanding of overall and individual risks. During the inspection, the prison held 37 low risk cases, 110 medium risk cases, 262 high risk cases and one very high risk case. There had been a 14% increase in the number of men held with a sexual offence from 50% at the last inspection to 64% at this inspection.
- 4.28** Public protection arrangements needed to reflect that good behaviour in prison did not necessarily mean a prisoner had reduced their risk of harm but instead had a lack of opportunity to offend. This meant risk assessments used a range of information to provide as many insights into the individual as possible.
- 4.29** All cases were screened on admission to identify child protection and harassment issues. Monitoring and restrictions were put in place and reviewed at the weekly inter-departmental risk management team meeting. Information from the security and public protection teams was shared during suitability and monitoring meetings (see paragraph 1.35). In addition, offender supervisors were informed of new information promptly, so they could review risks with community offender managers.
- 4.30** All prisoners were assigned a nominal multi-agency public protection arrangement (MAPPA) level. Six months before release steps were taken to confirm MAPPA levels prior to release. However, despite efforts by offender supervisors, some prisoners were released without their level being confirmed. We identified four prisoners who would have been released in the following few weeks without having had their MAPPA level set. While effective arrangements were in place with the Lincolnshire MAPPA coordinator so that issues could be escalated locally, only 12% of men were released to this area. Senior managers were considering how to develop escalation processes with other MAPPA coordinators. The prison contributed effectively to all MAPPA level 2 (medium risk) and 3 (high risk) cases. At the time of the inspection there were five level 3, 53 level 2 and 220 level 1 (the lowest risk) cases.
- 4.31** Victim safety was considered at all stages and specific licence conditions were used to enforce exclusion areas and reflect victims' wishes.

Recommendation

- 4.32 All MAPPA prisoners should have their level set prior to release.**

Categorisation

- 4.33** Some re-categorisation work had taken place, and focused on movement from category D to C (closed prison). Men were afraid of being returned to a category C prison, but we found the prison tried to keep men at the prison and worked with them to overcome difficulties. When men were returned, decisions were appropriate and based on confirmed increases in risk.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.34** The prison held 104 men serving life and 93 serving other indeterminate sentences. Staff had recently attended a national forum on the management of indeterminate sentence prisoners. The prison's policy focused on providing men with the opportunity to reduce their risks so

they could be released. These prisoners had access to ROTL opportunities. Some were frustrated with the delays in initial accompanied ROTL, which could have reduced the amount of time they could spend on unaccompanied ROTL before their parole hearings (see paragraphs 4.9 and 4.10 and recommendation 4.13). All of these prisoners were over tariff.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.35** In most cases reintegration planning started when the prisoner arrived at the prison and was appropriately linked to their individual needs, especially in relation to accessing ROTL. Men could establish a routine similar to one in the community. The work of Shelter (commissioned by the Humberside, Lincolnshire and North Yorkshire community rehabilitation company (CRC) to deliver its resettlement services at North Sea Camp) needed to be further developed and coordinated with the OMU and in too many cases did not start until too close to a prisoner's release date.
- 4.36** We assessed eight cases that were all due for release within the following month. In each case, a recent resettlement plan, established following a basic custody screening, was completed by the CRC. The time ahead of release was variable – in six cases the screening was done at least a month before release, a reasonable amount of time in which to resolve any resettlement issues.
- 4.37** Two cases, however, were completed much closer to the release date (seven and eight days), potentially compromising a well thought-through release. In one of these cases, appointments that should have been made as part of the prisoner's resettlement plan had been missed as the man was working outside the prison. Staff did not ensure that the objectives of the resettlement plan were prioritised by, for example, cancelling work if necessary.
- 4.38** Shelter staff relied on an interview with the prisoner for their information, despite having access to the OASys and P-Nomis records. Given the levels of risk most men posed, the assessment should have involved referring to OASys documents to confirm information.
- 4.39** The use of ROTL helped men adjust to life on release and we saw them being able to attend appointments with community offender managers, stay at approved premises and establish suitably supportive links to help reduce their risks on release.
- 4.40** Shelter's work was not consistently integrated with the OMU and information-sharing did not take place regularly. For example, one man who posed a high risk of harm to children was released without an address. As a temporary measure, he paid to stay in bed and breakfast accommodation but the risk assessment did not consider if children would be present.
- 4.41** The Jubilee units, four houses at the edge of the prison site, allowed men to live independently, while under supervision. Skills developed there included budgeting, cooking and caring for themselves, which were critical for those who had served long sentences. Places in the Jubilee units were sought after, and allocated after an assessment of men's needs and risks.

Recommendations

- 4.42** All prisoners should have their resettlement needs assessed at least 12 weeks before release, and any outstanding concerns should be met.
- 4.43** Assessments should make use of all forms of information.
- 4.44** The work of the CRC should be closely aligned with the OMU.

Good practice

- 4.45** *The Jubilee units gave prisoners the opportunity to practise living independently in preparation for their release.*

Accommodation

- 4.46** Most men were released to approved premises and many could stay there on ROTL before release. Due to pressure on the approved premise estate, some men only had places confirmed just before their release.
- 4.47** Shelter provided accommodation support primarily for men released in the area local to the prison. Support for men who were being released to other areas was, in some cases, more problematic because Shelter staff were not as knowledgeable about services elsewhere. Key information regarding prisoners' risks was appropriately shared when referrals were made to housing providers. (See also paragraph 4.40.)

Education, training and employment

- 4.48** The quality of provision delivered on behalf of the National Careers Service (NCS), provided by Futures Advice Skills and Employment, was good. Advisers worked well with education and prison staff to provide a good induction, which provided prisoners with effective careers advice and guidance. Futures staff helped prisoners develop skills action plans, which were used effectively to allocate men to activities.
- 4.49** The range of work available in the prison was wide, but not all jobs were accompanied by appropriate vocational training opportunities.
- 4.50** While no discrete 'pre-release' course was offered to all prisoners, residents in the Jubilee units could take a range of courses. In addition, personal finance, cookery and budget management courses were provided through the education department. A small number of prisoners could attend employability courses. Prison managers had introduced a formal employability qualification in a few work settings.
- 4.51** Prisoners approaching release were contacted by Futures staff to establish a release plan, which was used to review the progress they had made in custody and further action required before release. Staff also offered one-to-one CV writing help.
- 4.52** A regular job club, supported by a well-qualified peer mentor was held every week. Jobcentre Plus staff had agreed to attend the prison from summer 2017. They intended to use the virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities) to support online job searches and applications. (See paragraph 3.44).

- 4.53** Managers collected limited data to establish the number of prisoners gaining employment, training or education immediately on release. Futures staff attempted to track offenders after release, but the data obtained was incomplete. They did not sufficiently review the effectiveness of skills action plans to assess the impact of their service and advise prison managers on further improvements.

Recommendations

- 4.54** Senior managers should collect and analyse information on the number of prisoners who on release enter education, employment or training to support future service improvements.
- 4.55** NCS managers should conduct a searching review of the effectiveness of skills action plans to inform further improvements.

Health care

- 4.56** Prisoners were seen prior to discharge and appropriately supported, as long as the healthcare department received sufficient notice of their release. However, the GP could not currently provide a prescription for use in the community, but prisoners received information about registering with a GP, and would receive a supply of prescribed medicine to take with them on release if necessary. The mental health team had links with local community teams to support discharge planning where appropriate.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.57** Addaction had a strong presence in the local community and established links with several other services, enabling them to direct men to appropriate provision and arrange aftercare on release.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.58** There were some services for men with finance benefit and debt issues. Shelter could direct men to other agencies and had helped others to manage their debt while they were in custody. Men used ROTL to apply for benefits and open bank accounts in the community prior to release.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.59** The prison had recently drafted a family strategy, which was discussed at the regular reducing reoffending meeting. However, the work was not yet fully coordinated and family work was underdeveloped. The prison was waiting for a family engagement worker to take up their post under a regional contract.
- 4.60** Twenty men had participated in the Being A Dad course in the six months prior to the inspection. It was positive that over 250 men had been on ROTL for family contact purposes in the previous six months, as part of a planned resettlement process.

- 4.61** In our survey, only 20% of men told us it was easy for their family and friends to visit, lower than the comparator. The prison was difficult to access by public transport and it was helpful that prison transport could collect visitors from the train station free of charge.
- 4.62** Over 240 men had not received a visit in the six months before the inspection. Many men told us they could not receive visits because of the prison's distance from home. Although some men had ROTL and the prison encouraged men to use befriending and prisoner pen friend services, not enough was being done to gain an understanding of the number of prisoners who did not receive visits and why or to link men to their communities.
- 4.63** In our survey, over a third of men told us they had children under 18. It was positive that family days were held regularly during school holidays, but they had no allocated budget or staff time.
- 4.64** Families could phone the gate at certain times to book visits but there could be delays in answering calls if gate staff were busy. However, it was now possible to book online and visitors told us the system worked well.
- 4.65** Families could wait in a portacabin outside the prison where they could use toilets and access information. An orderly answered queries, but no refreshments were available. Searching procedures were appropriate for a low security prison.
- 4.66** There were five visits sessions a week, with room for 14 families. The visits room was relaxed, had a good selection of refreshments and a small play area. The room was bright and cheerful and there was a well-maintained garden. Visits were supervised appropriately. Families told us, and we observed, that gate and visits staff were friendly and helpful.

Recommendations

- 4.67** **The prison should do more to understand who does not receive visits and why, and support men's links with the outside world.**
- 4.68** **Family days should be appropriately resourced.**

Good practice

- 4.69** *The prison transport service made visits more accessible for prisoners' family and friends.*

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.70** The prison did not deliver any nationally accredited offending behaviour programmes. It was expected that in most cases men would have completed the work prior to achieving category D status. However, the prison could provide additional individual work through the psychology department or probation staff prior to release. There were plans to train offender supervisors to run booster workshops with prisoners to reinforce lessons learned from previously completed offending behaviour programmes.

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice

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

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1 Rooms designed for one man should not accommodate two and men should have space to store their possessions properly. (S42)
- 5.2 The number of external work placements should be increased and provide suitable preparation for employment on release. (S43)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.3 The prison should determine why some men feel unsafe on their first night and address any arising issues. (1.11)
- 5.4 Induction should take place in a quiet room without other men distracting new arrivals. (1.12)
- 5.5 Men should be supported by unit staff to find their next accommodation upon completing their induction. (1.13)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.6 Staff facilitating mediation between prisoners should be appropriately trained. (1.20, repeated recommendation 1.19)
- 5.7 Links between safer custody and security should be strengthened to ensure both departments gain a full picture of antisocial behaviour at the prison. (1.21)
- 5.8 The prison should improve its analysis of antisocial behaviour so trends can be identified at the earliest opportunity and action taken promptly. (1.22)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.9 All staff should receive suicide and self-harm training. (1.27)

Safeguarding

- 5.10 Appropriate safeguarding training should be available to all staff. (1.31)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.11** Prisoners should be removed from the basic level following a review if no further poor behaviour is observed. (1.42)
- 5.12** Prisoners on the enhanced level who are returned to closed conditions due to poor behaviour should have the opportunity to attend a review board or make a representation to it. (1.43)

Residential units

- 5.13** All showers and toilets should be in a reasonable state of repair and suitable for use. (2.10)

Equality and diversity

- 5.14** Equality monitoring data and prisoners' views should be analysed routinely to help managers identify and investigate areas of possible discrimination. (2.21)
- 5.15** The prison should assess the needs of less able and older men and implement a strategy to meet their needs, which should include physical adaptations where necessary. (2.32)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.16** The washing facilities in the multi-faith room should be refurbished. (2.39)

Legal rights

- 5.17** Legal visits should take place in sufficient privacy. (2.44, repeated recommendation 2.53)

Health services

- 5.18** A representative health forum should be set up to inform service developments and enable collective concerns to be addressed. (2.55)
- 5.19** Access to podiatry services should be equivalent to community provision. (2.61)
- 5.20** Adequate arrangements for reconciling and disposing of unused medicines should be in place. (2.67)
- 5.21** Patients should receive medicine confidentially and officers should oversee supervised medicines. (2.68)
- 5.22** Medications not given in possession should be administered as clinically indicated and documented risk assessments should be completed before in-possession medication is considered and recorded on SystemOne. (2.69)
- 5.23** Patients should have access to dental assessment and NHS treatments in line with community provision. (2.72)
- 5.24** Patients requiring counselling support should have access to appropriate services. (2.77)

Time out of cell

- 5.25** The space for association should be increased and rooms should be properly equipped. (3.3)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.26** Relationships with employers and other external agencies should be further improved to increase the proportion of prisoners who work outside the prison. (3.12)
- 5.27** All staff should analyse and make good use of data to improve the quality of the provision and measure the impact of their actions. (3.13)
- 5.28** The prison should introduce a greater number and range of functional skills and employability courses to meet the resettlement needs of the population. (3.18)
- 5.29** The level and range of the education and training provision should be extended to meet the needs of those with higher prior academic attainment. (3.19)
- 5.30** The integration of English and maths skills should be promoted in all work and training settings. (3.28)
- 5.31** Prisoners should have access to sufficient computing facilities, including the virtual campus. (3.29)
- 5.32** The prison should ensure there are appropriate vocational training opportunities across all work settings. (3.36)
- 5.33** Immediate action should be taken to drive up success rates further on English and maths courses. (3.40)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.34** Senior managers should ensure all repairs and routine maintenance are carried out promptly. (3.51)
- 5.35** Senior managers should ensure showers and toilets have sufficient screening. (3.52)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.36** The offending needs analysis should be informed by OASys and resettlement needs data. (4.12)
- 5.37** The allocation process for accompanied ROTL should be reviewed to ensure allocations are suitable. Prisoners should be informed of intended timescales. (4.13)
- 5.38** The prison should monitor delays at each stage of the ROTL process to ensure barriers to progress are minimised. (4.14)
- 5.39** HMPPS should amend their prisoner employment performance targets so that prisons facilitating the effective use of ROTL to promote employment skills are not disadvantaged. (4.15)

Offender management and planning

- 5.40** Risk assessments should consider the inherent risks of all offending behaviour not just those that appear violent. (4.25)
- 5.41** Risk management plans should be current and comprehensive covering risk management in open conditions and for release. (4.26)
- 5.42** All MAPPA prisoners should have their level set prior to release. (4.32)

Reintegration planning

- 5.43** All prisoners should have their resettlement needs assessed at least 12 weeks before release, and any outstanding concerns should be met. (4.42)
- 5.44** Assessments should make use of all forms of information. (4.43)
- 5.45** The work of the CRC should be closely aligned with the OMU. (4.44)
- 5.46** Senior managers should collect and analyse information on the number of prisoners who on release enter education, employment or training to support future service improvements. (4.54)
- 5.47** NCS managers should conduct a searching review of the effectiveness of skills action plans to inform further improvements. (4.55)
- 5.48** The prison should do more to understand who does not receive visits and why, and support men's links with the outside world. (4.67)
- 5.49** Family days should be appropriately resourced. (4.68)

Examples of good practice

- 5.50** The ISR and SAM meetings ensured that prisoners were kept safe and that those who presented an immediate or increased risk received appropriate support. (1.38)
- 5.51** The involvement of probation officers in work to support protected characteristic groups was a novel way to encourage a 'whole-prison' approach and it promoted confidence in equality management. (2.22)
- 5.52** The drop-in enabled prisoners to resolve financial and canteen queries promptly. (2.87)
- 5.53** The Jubilee units gave prisoners the opportunity to practise living independently in preparation for their release. (4.45)
- 5.54** The prison transport service made visits more accessible for prisoners' family and friends. (4.69)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Peter Clarke	Chief inspector
Keith McInnis	Team leader
Francesca Cooney	Inspector
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Martyn Griffiths	Inspector
Jeanette Hall	Inspector
Yvonne McGuckian	Inspector
Caroline Wright	Inspector
Anna Fenton	Researcher
Helen Ranns	Researcher
Emma Seymour	Researcher
Catherine Shaw	Researcher
Steve Eley	Health services inspector
Tim Byrom	Care Quality Commission inspector
Matthew Tedstone	Care Quality Commission inspector
Ken Fisher	Ofsted inspector
Daniel Grant	Ofsted inspector
Gerard McGrath	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

Safety

Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.

At the last inspection, in 2014, early days and induction arrangements were mostly good, and enhanced by effective peer support. Levels of violence were low but sex offenders faced offence-related intimidation and many prisoners told us that they felt unsafe because of uncertainty about being in an open prison and the lack of communication with the offender management unit. Oversight of safety arrangements was insufficiently well focused. Support for prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm was generally appropriate. Security arrangements were broadly proportionate and disciplinary procedures managed fairly. Illicit drugs were easily available but too little action was taken to address this issue. Substance misuse services were very good. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

Prisoners should be consulted about their feelings of safety, and data on safety should be accurate and analysed and should inform an action plan to make prisoners feel safer. (S43)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

Prisoners should not be held on escort vans for long periods. (1.4)

Achieved

The accommodation on South I should be fit for purpose and provide all basic facilities such as bedding and pillows. (1.11)

Partially achieved

New prisoners should be able to contact family and friends as soon as possible after arrival. (1.12)

Achieved

Unit staff should allocate accommodation to prisoners moving on from the induction unit. (1.13)

Not achieved

Staff facilitating mediation between prisoners should be appropriately trained. (1.19)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.20)

All relevant staff should have up-to-date assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) training, and Listeners should receive training for the role. (1.26.)

Not achieved

Staff should complete adult safeguarding training to ensure that they are aware of and understand their reporting responsibilities in line with the policy and guidance. (1.31)

Not achieved

All requested intelligence-led searches should be carried out. (1.40)

Not achieved

A drug and alcohol strategy should be developed and include a specific supply reduction approach, detailed action plans and performance measures. (1.41)

Achieved

Management oversight of adjudication processes and the analysis of data should be improved. (1.50)

Achieved

The prison and substance use service providers should ensure that prisoners are made aware that they can access services without fear of negative consequences. (1.56.)

Achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2014, the grounds were well maintained and attractive. Residential areas were clean but older units were shabby and some accommodation was cramped, with single cells continuing to be used for two. The Jubilee accommodation was excellent. Prisoners had little confidence in the application system. The prisoner advice centre was an excellent initiative. Prisoners were mostly very positive about relationships and support from staff. Equality and diversity work had only recently restarted but the needs of minority groups were mostly met. Complaints, although well managed, were not sufficiently well analysed. Health services were good. The quality and quantity of the food provided were very good. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

Rooms designed for one should not accommodate two and the number of beds in the larger dormitories should be reduced to make them less cramped. (2.10)

Not achieved

All prisoners should have keys to room safes to enable them to store their possessions and medications securely. (2.11)

Not achieved

The equality policy should be based on a needs analysis. (2.25)

Not achieved

Data from the equality monitoring tool should be available and analysed. (2.26)

Not achieved

Lead staff should be involved in prisoner support groups, and issues raised there should be discussed and addressed by the equality action team (EAT). (2.27)

Partially achieved

The EAT should investigate the dissatisfaction expressed in our survey by Gypsy/Romany/Traveller prisoners and those with disabilities, and take any necessary action. (2.28.)

Partially achieved

Care planning for older prisoners and those with disabilities should be multidisciplinary. (2.29)

Not achieved

Faith-based resettlement work should be introduced. (2.44)

Achieved

Complaints should be monitored to identify trends, issues and themes. (2.49)

Achieved

Legal visits should take place in sufficient privacy. (2.53)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.44)

There should be an up-to-date health needs analysis. (2.71)

Achieved

There should be a patient forum. (2.72.)

Not achieved

There should be a local information-sharing protocol. (2.73)

Achieved

Access to the bathroom in the primary care centre should not be from a public area. (2.74)

Not achieved

Resuscitation equipment should be promptly accessible in all parts of the prison, and clinicians should have direct telephone access to the ambulance service. (2.75)

Achieved

There should be a prison well-being and health promotion strategy. (2.76)

Not achieved

There should be a suitable room for health screening in reception which has access to SystemOne. (2.82.)

Achieved

There should be sufficient resources to facilitate external health appointments for prisoners who require them. (2.83)

Achieved

Prisoners should have regular access to pharmacy clinics, including medicines use reviews. (2.92)

Achieved

'Not in-possession' medications should be administered as clinically indicated. (2.93)

Partially achieved

Documented risk assessments should be completed before in-possession medication is considered and these should be recorded on SystemOne. (2.94)

Not achieved

A single clinical system for the prescribing and recording of the administration of medicines should be implemented. (2.95)

Achieved

Prisoners should be able to receive over-the-counter remedies when the health care department is closed. (2.96)

No longer relevant

Administration of medicines at the pharmacy hatch should be carried out in a confidential manner and the queue should be supervised. (2.97)

Not achieved

Prisoners should have access to the prison shop within 24 hours of arrival. (2.120)

Achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2014, prisoners were unlocked all day and had much free access around the prison, but recreational activities were limited. The prison had a clear learning and skills and work strategy to support the resettlement of prisoners but plans were not yet fully realised. Although there were sufficient activity places, vocational training opportunities were too limited and opportunities to accredit work and employability skills were missed. The quality of teaching and learning and achievement of qualifications for those who took them were good. Library services and access were very good. The PE facilities were well used but equipment was in poor condition, and there was minimal health promotion. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

The range of education classes and the number of vocational training opportunities should be increased and prisoners should have the opportunity to have their work and employability skills recognised and recorded. They should have access to job search facilities, including the virtual campus and Jobcentre Plus staff. (S44)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

Association rooms should be properly equipped and maintained on all units. (3.6)

Not achieved

The plans for developing learning and skills and work provision that are focused on prisoners getting jobs or entering education and training on release should be implemented. (3.14)

Achieved

The quality of prison-funded provision should be monitored and evaluated thoroughly and include observations of teaching and learning. (3.15)

Achieved

The prison should provide sufficient access to computers with up-to-date software and printing facilities for prisoners to use when studying higher-level courses. (3.20)

Not achieved

The benefits for prisoners of improving their English and mathematics should be promoted more effectively, and provision offered more widely. (3.21)

Not achieved

Allocations to work should match needs identified in sentence plans and by the National Careers Service. (3.22)

Achieved

The provision of additional learning support should be increased. (3.29)

Achieved

A higher proportion of prisoners should obtain English and mathematics qualifications before leaving the prison. (3.34)

Achieved

PE equipment in poor condition should be repaired or replaced, and outdoor facilities used effectively. (3.45)

Achieved

The gym should provide a suitable range of vocational qualifications. (3.46)

Achieved

The promotion and take-up of healthy living initiatives should be increased. (3.47)

Achieved

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection, in 2014, the strategic management of resettlement was reasonably good. Severe staff shortages hampered the delivery of effective offender management, hindering prisoners' progression and causing considerable frustration. The new national release on temporary licence (ROTL) processes were being introduced and ROTL risk assessments had improved. However, delays in processes and poor communication increased prisoners' levels of anxiety. Home detention curfew processes were good. Public protection arrangements were mostly sound but there was insufficient focus on multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) cases. Some resettlement pathway provision was underdeveloped and opportunities for suitably risk assessed prisoners to work outside on ROTL were limited. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

There should be sufficient staff resources to deliver effective offender management, including timely and better quality offender assessment system (OASys) reviews and release on temporary licence, and communication with prisoners should be improved significantly. (S45)

Partially achieved

All multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) prisoners should have their management level set on arrival in open conditions, and where necessary a multi-agency plan should be in place to manage risk of harm during unsupervised day release. (S46)

Partially achieved

The number of external work placements should be increased and provide suitable preparation for employment on release. (S47)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

Offender supervisors should be adequately trained in the management of risk of harm and indeterminate-sentenced prisoners. (4.8)

Achieved

Information in release on temporary licence risk assessments should be updated to reflect each review. (4.20)

Achieved

The quality of risk of harm analyses and plans should be improved. (4.26)

Partially achieved

The role of the interdepartmental risk management team (IRMT) and public protection meeting should be clarified and actions set by the IRMT should be regularly reviewed to ensure that they are achieved. (4.27)

Achieved

More housing support and advice should be available from trained staff and peer mentors. (4.33)

Partially achieved

Prisoners should be able to access specialist support and advice about finance benefit and debts, and should be able to open a bank account before release. (4.45)

Achieved

The visits booking system should be reviewed and improved. (4.52)

Partially achieved

The children and family pathway should be developed, in consultation with prisoners and their families, to meet need. (4.53)

Partially achieved

Structured offending behaviour work should be provided to support previous work undertaken or address remaining issues. (4.56)

Partially achieved

Appendix III: Prison population profile

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

Population breakdown by: 04/07/17

Status	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced		401	
Recall		9	
Convicted unsentenced		Nil	
Remand		Nil	
Civil prisoners		Nil	
Detainees		Nil	
Total		410	

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced		Nil	
Less than 6 months			
6 months to less than 12 months		2	0.5%
12 months to less than 2 years		5	1.2%
2 years to less than 4 years		32	7.8%
4 years to less than 10 years		128	31.2%
10 years and over (not life)		47	11.5%
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)		96	23.4%
Life		100	24%
Total		410	100%

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here:		
Under 21 years		
21 years to 29 years	48	11.7%
30 years to 39 years	102	24.9%
40 years to 49 years	110	26.8%
50 years to 59 years	95	23.2%
60 years to 69 years	42	10.2%
70 plus years	13	3.2%
Please state maximum age here:	77	
Total	410	100%

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British		404	98.5%
Foreign nationals		6	1.5%
Total		410	100%

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced			
Uncategorised sentenced			
Category A			
Category B			
Category C			
Category D		410	100%
Other			
Total			

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British		321	78.3%
Irish		6	1.5%
Gypsy/Irish Traveller		8	2.0%
Other white			
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean		7	1.7%
White and black African			
White and Asian		1	0.2%
Other mixed			
Asian or Asian British			
Indian		6	1.5%
Pakistani		11	2.7%
Bangladeshi		6	1.5%
Chinese		1	0.2%
Other Asian		2	0.5%
Black or black British			
Caribbean		16	3.9%
African		11	2.7%
Other black		3	0.7%
Other ethnic group			
Arab			
Other ethnic group		1	0.2%
Not stated		1	0.2%
Total		410	100%

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist		1	0.2%
Church of England		66	16.1%
Roman Catholic		36	8.8%
Other Christian denominations		52	12.7%
Muslim		38	9.3%
Sikh			
Hindu		3	0.7%
Buddhist		23	5.6%
Jewish			
Other		14	3.4%
No religion		177	43.2%
Total		410	100%

Other demographics	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)		14	3.43%
Total		14	3.43%

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month			37	9.0%
1 month to 3 months			54	13.2%
3 months to 6 months			101	24.6%
6 months to 1 year			124	30.2%
1 year to 2 years			76	18.5%
2 years to 4 years			17	4.1%
4 years or more			1	0.2%
Total			410	100%

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry			
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).			
Total			

Main offence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person		82	20%
Sexual offences		240	59%
Burglary		9	2%
Robbery		13	3%
Theft and handling		6	1%
Fraud and forgery		7	2%
Drugs offences		29	7%
Other offences		23	5%
Civil offences		1	1%
Offence not recorded /holding warrant			
Total		410	100%

Appendix IV: 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.

Sampling

The prisoner survey was conducted on a representative sample of the prison population. Using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician we calculated the sample size required to ensure that our survey findings reflected the experiences of the entire population of the establishment⁸. Respondents were then randomly selected from a P-Nomis prisoner population printout using a systematic sampling method.

Distributing and collecting questionnaires

Every attempt was made to distribute the questionnaires to respondents individually. This gave researchers an opportunity to explain the purpose of the survey and to answer respondents' questions. We also stressed the voluntary nature of the survey and provided assurances about confidentiality and the independence of the Inspectorate. This information is also provided in writing on the front cover of the questionnaire.

Our questionnaire is available in a number of different languages and via a telephone translation service for respondents who do not read English. Respondents with literacy difficulties were offered the option of an interview.

Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire. In order to ensure confidentiality, respondents were asked to seal their completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and either hand it back to a member of the research team at a specified time or leave it in their room for collection.

Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them.

Survey response

At the time of the survey on 3 July 2017 the prisoner population at HMP North Sea Camp was 411. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 206 prisoners.

We received a total of 187 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 91%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Four respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and 15 questionnaires were not returned.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
Harrison	27
Jubilee	32
Llewellyn	26
North	41
South	61

⁸ 95% confidence interval with a sampling error of 7%. The formula assumes a 75% response rate (65% in open establishments) and we routinely 'oversample' to ensure we achieve the minimum number of responses required.

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP North Sea Camp.

First a full breakdown of responses is provided for each question. In this full breakdown all percentages, including those for filtered questions, refer to the full sample. Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant differences⁹ are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in prisoners' background details.

Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation of how the filter has been applied. Percentages for filtered questions refer to the number of respondents filtered to that question. For all other questions, percentages refer to the entire sample. All missing responses have been excluded from analyses.

Percentages shown in the full breakdown may differ slightly from those shown in the comparative analyses. This is because the data have been weighted to enable valid statistical comparison between establishments.

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP North Sea Camp in 2017 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 14 open prisons since April 2013.
- The current survey responses from HMP North Sea Camp in 2017 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP North Sea Camp in 2014.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2017 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 2017 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between those who considered themselves to be a veteran and those who did not.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of prisoners in Jubilee units 2 to 5 and the rest of the establishment.

⁹ A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.01 which means that there is only a 1% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

Survey summary

Section I: About You

Q1.1	What wing or houseblock are you currently living on? See survey methodology		
Q1.2	How old are you?		
	Under 21	0	(0%)
	21 - 29	18	(10%)
	30 - 39	43	(23%)
	40 - 49	51	(28%)
	50 - 59	45	(24%)
	60 - 69	22	(12%)
	70 and over	6	(3%)
Q1.3	Are you on recall?		
	Yes	5	(3%)
	No	171	(97%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Less than 6 months	1	(1%)
	6 months to less than 1 year	1	(1%)
	1 year to less than 2 years	9	(5%)
	2 years to less than 4 years	17	(9%)
	4 years to less than 10 years	51	(27%)
	10 years or more	20	(11%)
	IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	42	(23%)
	Life	45	(24%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?		
	Yes	5	(3%)
	No	182	(97%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	Yes	185	(99%)
	No	2	(1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	Yes	185	(99%)
	No	2	(1%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)	145 (78%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese..... 1 (1%)
	White - Irish	2 (1%)	Asian or Asian British - other
	White - other	14 (8%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean. 2 (1%)
	Black or black British - Caribbean.....	5 (3%)	Mixed race - white and black African 0 (0%)
	Black or black British - African	4 (2%)	Mixed race - white and Asian..... 1 (1%)
	Black or black British - other	1 (1%)	Mixed race - other
	Asian or Asian British - Indian.....	1 (1%)	Arab..... 0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	4 (2%)	Other ethnic group
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	4 (2%)	1 (1%)

Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
	Yes	5 (3%)	
	No.....	176 (97%)	
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	None.....	59 (32%)	Hindu
	Church of England	53 (29%)	Jewish
	Catholic	19 (10%)	Muslim
	Protestant.....	2 (1%)	Sikh
	Other Christian denomination	11 (6%)	Other.....
	Buddhist	13 (7%)	
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	Heterosexual/ Straight	169 (92%)	
	Homosexual/Gay.....	6 (3%)	
	Bisexual.....	9 (5%)	
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	45 (24%)	
	No.....	141 (76%)	
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?		
	Yes	20 (11%)	
	No.....	165 (89%)	
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	Yes	95 (51%)	
	No.....	92 (49%)	
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	Yes	64 (34%)	
	No.....	122 (66%)	

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	41 (22%)	
	2 hours or longer	134 (72%)	
	Don't remember	11 (6%)	
Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?		
	My journey was less than two hours	41 (22%)	
	Yes	116 (63%)	
	No.....	21 (11%)	
	Don't remember	7 (4%)	
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?		
	My journey was less than two hours	41 (22%)	
	Yes	14 (8%)	
	No.....	126 (68%)	
	Don't remember	5 (3%)	

Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes	134 (72%)
	No.....	48 (26%)
	Don't remember	4 (2%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	153 (82%)
	No.....	31 (17%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well.....	86 (46%)
	Well.....	70 (38%)
	Neither.....	22 (12%)
	Badly.....	5 (3%)
	Very badly	1 (1%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)
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	142 (76%)
	Yes, I received written information	42 (23%)
	No, I was not told anything	17 (9%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	167 (90%)
	No.....	19 (10%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	151 (81%)
	2 hours or longer	25 (13%)
	Don't remember	10 (5%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	155 (86%)
	No	13 (7%)
	Don't remember	13 (7%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well.....	94 (51%)
	Well.....	76 (41%)
	Neither.....	7 (4%)
	Badly.....	4 (2%)
	Very badly.....	1 (1%)
	Don't remember	2 (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>	23 (12%)	<i>Physical health</i>	27 (15%)
<i>Housing problems</i>	21 (11%)	<i>Mental health</i>	22 (12%)
<i>Contacting employers</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i>	6 (3%)
<i>Contacting family</i>	18 (10%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i>	19 (10%)
<i>Childcare</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Other</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Money worries</i>	17 (9%)	<i>Did not have any problems</i>	95 (51%)
<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	11 (6%)		

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

<i>Yes</i>	50 (27%)
<i>No</i>	37 (20%)
<i>Did not have any problems</i>	95 (52%)

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

<i>Tobacco</i>	130 (71%)
<i>A shower</i>	102 (55%)
<i>A free telephone call</i>	40 (22%)
<i>Something to eat</i>	116 (63%)
<i>PIN phone credit</i>	109 (59%)
<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i>	126 (68%)
<i>Did not receive anything</i>	12 (7%)

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>	121 (66%)
<i>Someone from health services</i>	162 (88%)
<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>	107 (58%)
<i>Prison shop/ canteen</i>	70 (38%)
<i>Did not have access to any of these</i>	8 (4%)

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>	129 (72%)
<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	112 (63%)
<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>	116 (65%)
<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>	104 (58%)
<i>Health services</i>	140 (79%)
<i>Chaplaincy</i>	124 (70%)
<i>Not offered any information</i>	14 (8%)

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

<i>Yes</i>	152 (82%)
<i>No</i>	29 (16%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (2%)

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

<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Within the first week</i>	175 (94%)
<i>More than a week</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (1%)

Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Yes</i>	142 (77%)
	<i>No</i>	34 (18%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (2%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	111 (60%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	43 (23%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	19 (10%)

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>	53 (29%)	49 (27%)	21 (11%)	11 (6%)	6 (3%)	43 (23%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	39 (24%)	36 (22%)	15 (9%)	8 (5%)	4 (2%)	60 (37%)
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>						57 (31%)
	<i>Yes</i>						30 (16%)
	<i>No</i>						99 (53%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?						
	<i>Yes</i>						124 (67%)
	<i>No</i>						3 (2%)
	<i>Don't know</i>						57 (31%)
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>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	184 (99%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	166 (91%)	13 (7%)	4 (2%)			
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	119 (65%)	59 (32%)	6 (3%)			
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	146 (79%)	38 (21%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	101 (56%)	34 (19%)	46 (25%)			
Q4.5	What is the food like here?						
	<i>Very good</i>						84 (45%)
	<i>Good</i>						76 (41%)
	<i>Neither</i>						18 (10%)
	<i>Bad</i>						4 (2%)
	<i>Very bad</i>						3 (2%)
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>						5 (3%)
	<i>Yes</i>						133 (72%)
	<i>No</i>						48 (26%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?						
	<i>Yes</i>						160 (86%)
	<i>No</i>						5 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i>						20 (11%)

Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	99 (53%)
	No.....	15 (8%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	73 (39%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	121 (65%)
	No.....	9 (5%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	56 (30%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	50 (27%)
	Very easy.....	70 (38%)
	Easy.....	31 (17%)
	Neither	3 (2%)
	Difficult.....	4 (2%)
	Very difficult.....	3 (2%)
	Don't know	21 (12%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?			
	Yes	166 (89%)		
	No	14 (8%)		
	Don't know	6 (3%)		
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications. (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)			
		Not made one		
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with fairly?	11 (6%)	137 (78%)	28 (16%)
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	11 (6%)	101 (59%)	58 (34%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes	110 (59%)		
	No	20 (11%)		
	Don't know	57 (30%)		
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints. (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with fairly?	103 (57%)	36 (20%)	43 (24%)
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	103 (58%)	30 (17%)	45 (25%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes	24 (14%)		
	No.....	149 (86%)		
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>	25 (14%)		
	Very easy.....	48 (26%)		
	Easy.....	47 (26%)		
	Neither	44 (24%)		
	Difficult.....	10 (5%)		
	Very difficult.....	9 (5%)		

Section 6: Relationships with staff

Q6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	174 (93%)
	No	13 (7%)
Q6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	165 (90%)
	No	18 (10%)
Q6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	78 (42%)
	No	107 (58%)
Q6.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>Never</i>	29 (16%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	38 (21%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	52 (28%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	24 (13%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	27 (15%)
Q6.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	21 (11%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	85 (46%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	70 (38%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	10 (5%)
Q6.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	21 (11%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	79 (43%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	46 (25%)
	<i>Neither</i>	20 (11%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	12 (6%)

Section 7: Safety

Q7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	54 (29%)
	No	132 (71%)
Q7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	17 (9%)
	No	167 (91%)

Q7.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	132 (75%)
	Everywhere	9 (5%)
	Association areas	14 (8%)
	Reception area	2 (1%)
	At the gym	12 (7%)
	In an exercise yard	5 (3%)
	At work	8 (5%)
	During movement	8 (5%)
	At education	1 (1%)
	At meal times	15 (8%)
	At health services	2 (1%)
	Visits area.....	1 (1%)
	In wing showers.....	14 (8%)
	In gym showers.....	3 (2%)
	In corridors/stairwells	8 (5%)
	On your landing/wing.....	11 (6%)
	In your cell.....	12 (7%)
	At religious services	0 (0%)
Q7.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	Yes	42 (23%)
	No.....	142 (77%)
Q7.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)	19 (10%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)	3 (2%)
	Sexual abuse	3 (2%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated	25 (14%)
	Having your canteen/property taken.....	3 (2%)
	Medication.....	4 (2%)
	Debt	1 (1%)
	Drugs.....	0 (0%)
	Your race or ethnic origin.....	5 (3%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs	5 (3%)
	Your nationality	1 (1%)
	You are from a different part of the country than others.....	9 (5%)
	You are from a traveller community	3 (2%)
	Your sexual orientation	7 (4%)
	Your age.....	2 (1%)
	You have a disability.....	5 (3%)
	You were new here.....	4 (2%)
	Your offence/ crime	24 (13%)
	Gang related issues.....	2 (1%)
Q7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	30 (16%)
	No.....	152 (84%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	8 (4%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	18 (10%)
<i>Medication</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	2 (1%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	2 (1%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	2 (1%)
<i>You were new here</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	8 (4%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)

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

<i>Not been victimised</i>	124 (71%)
<i>Yes</i>	20 (11%)
<i>No</i>	30 (17%)

Section 8: Health services**Q8.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?:**

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	13 (7%)	23 (13%)	57 (31%)	20 (11%)	57 (31%)	13 (7%)
The nurse	7 (4%)	57 (32%)	88 (49%)	9 (5%)	12 (7%)	5 (3%)
The dentist	32 (18%)	4 (2%)	10 (6%)	10 (6%)	37 (21%)	87 (48%)

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

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	21 (11%)	46 (25%)	65 (35%)	27 (15%)	15 (8%)	10 (5%)
The nurse	6 (3%)	70 (38%)	67 (36%)	18 (10%)	15 (8%)	8 (4%)
The dentist	78 (43%)	11 (6%)	25 (14%)	18 (10%)	15 (8%)	35 (19%)

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

<i>Not been</i>	6 (3%)
<i>Very good</i>	43 (24%)
<i>Good</i>	77 (42%)
<i>Neither</i>	25 (14%)
<i>Bad</i>	17 (9%)
<i>Very bad</i>	14 (8%)

Q8.4 Are you currently taking medication?

<i>Yes</i>	127 (69%)
<i>No</i>	57 (31%)

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

<i>Not taking medication</i>	57 (31%)
<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	106 (58%)
<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	21 (11%)
<i>No</i>	0 (0%)

Q8.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes	51 (28%)
	No.....	133 (72%)
Q8.7	Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison (e.g psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?	
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems.....</i>	133 (73%)
	Yes	40 (22%)
	No.....	9 (5%)

Section 9: Drugs and alcohol

Q9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	15 (8%)
	No.....	169 (92%)
Q9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	20 (11%)
	No.....	163 (89%)
Q9.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	25 (14%)
	Easy	19 (10%)
	Neither	4 (2%)
	Difficult.....	3 (2%)
	Very difficult.....	3 (2%)
	Don't know	128 (70%)
Q9.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	11 (6%)
	Easy	15 (8%)
	Neither	4 (2%)
	Difficult.....	5 (3%)
	Very difficult.....	4 (2%)
	Don't know	143 (79%)
Q9.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	2 (1%)
	No.....	181 (99%)
Q9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	2 (1%)
	No.....	180 (99%)
Q9.7	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	164 (92%)
	Yes	14 (8%)
	No.....	1 (1%)
Q9.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	163 (93%)
	Yes	13 (7%)
	No.....	0 (0%)

Q9.9	Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	150 (87%)
	<i>Yes</i>	21 (12%)
	<i>No</i>	2 (1%)

Section 10: Activities

Q10.1	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	7 (4%)	74 (41%)	71 (39%)	13 (7%)	14 (8%)	3 (2%)
	Vocational or skills training	19 (11%)	32 (18%)	65 (36%)	25 (14%)	26 (14%)	13 (7%)
	Education (including basic skills)	16 (9%)	45 (25%)	71 (39%)	22 (12%)	16 (9%)	11 (6%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	108 (62%)	11 (6%)	18 (10%)	18 (10%)	7 (4%)	11 (6%)
Q10.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>						17 (9%)
	Prison job.....						153 (84%)
	Vocational or skills training.....						32 (18%)
	Education (including basic skills).....						37 (20%)
	Offending behaviour programmes.....						4 (2%)
Q10.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?						
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>		
	Prison job	7 (4%)	90 (52%)	64 (37%)	12 (7%)		
	Vocational or skills training	26 (18%)	81 (56%)	29 (20%)	8 (6%)		
	Education (including basic skills)	25 (17%)	78 (54%)	29 (20%)	12 (8%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes	50 (39%)	33 (26%)	26 (20%)	19 (15%)		
Q10.4	How often do you usually go to the library?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						9 (5%)
	<i>Never</i>						5 (3%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i>						35 (19%)
	<i>About once a week</i>						42 (23%)
	<i>More than once a week</i>						93 (51%)
Q10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?						
	<i>Don't use it</i>						14 (8%)
	<i>Yes</i>						149 (81%)
	<i>No</i>						21 (11%)
Q10.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						53 (29%)
	<i>0</i>						40 (22%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>						22 (12%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>						50 (27%)
	<i>More than 5</i>						18 (10%)
Q10.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						7 (4%)
	<i>0</i>						5 (3%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>						15 (8%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>						26 (14%)
	<i>More than 5</i>						129 (71%)

Q10.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>0</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	11 (6%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	139 (77%)

Q10.9	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>	3 (2%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	10 (5%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	27 (15%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	23 (13%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	107 (58%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	6 (3%)

Section 11: Contact with family and friends

Q11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	111 (62%)
	<i>No</i>	67 (38%)
Q11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	35 (19%)
	<i>No</i>	147 (81%)
Q11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	45 (24%)
	<i>No</i>	139 (76%)
Q11.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	38 (21%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	8 (4%)
	<i>Easy</i>	28 (15%)
	<i>Neither</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	43 (23%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	53 (29%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	6 (3%)

Section 12: Preparation for release

Q12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Yes</i>	179 (98%)
	<i>No</i>	3 (2%)
Q12.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Do not have an offender manager/ NA</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>No contact</i>	25 (14%)
	<i>Letter</i>	84 (47%)
	<i>Phone</i>	135 (75%)
	<i>Visit</i>	48 (27%)

Q12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	175 (96%)
	No.....	8 (4%)
Q12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	Yes	156 (87%)
	No.....	23 (13%)
Q12.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	23 (13%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	54 (30%)
	<i>Involved</i>	60 (33%)
	<i>Neither</i>	16 (9%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	14 (8%)
Q12.6	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</i>	23 (13%)
	<i>Nobody</i>	30 (17%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	114 (63%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>	88 (49%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	58 (32%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	44 (24%)
Q12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	23 (13%)
	Yes	114 (64%)
	No.....	12 (7%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	29 (16%)
Q12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	23 (13%)
	Yes	16 (9%)
	No.....	114 (64%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	25 (14%)
Q12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	23 (13%)
	Yes	90 (51%)
	No.....	29 (16%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	36 (20%)
Q12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	
	Yes	15 (8%)
	No.....	64 (36%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	100 (56%)
Q12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?	
	Yes	88 (49%)
	No.....	91 (51%)

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

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	38 (22%)	59 (34%)	76 (44%)
Accommodation	35 (20%)	62 (36%)	76 (44%)
Benefits	33 (19%)	57 (33%)	81 (47%)
Finances	48 (29%)	44 (27%)	74 (45%)
Education	53 (32%)	58 (35%)	55 (33%)
Drugs and alcohol	71 (43%)	50 (30%)	43 (26%)

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

	Yes	No
Resettlement day release	127 (71%)	52 (29%)
Resettlement overnight release	109 (61%)	69 (39%)

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

	Yes	No
Resettlement day release	89 (50%)	88 (50%)
Resettlement overnight release	49 (29%)	121 (71%)
Special purpose leave	76 (45%)	93 (55%)

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

	Yes	No
Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here	65 (36%)	117 (64%)
Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility, freedom e.t.c.)	54 (30%)	126 (70%)
Do you feel you have been given a greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions	146 (81%)	34 (19%)
Have you been on a preparation for release course	23 (13%)	156 (87%)
Is this prison near your home area or intended release address	34 (19%)	145 (81%)
Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that will make you less likely to offend in the future	107 (61%)	69 (39%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP North Sea Camp 2017

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

Key to tables		HMP North Sea Camp 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP North Sea Camp 2017	HMP North Sea Camp 2014
	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		187	1,981	187	160
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	1%	0%	0%
1.3	Are you on recall?	3%	2%	3%	5%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	1%	3%	1%	1%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	23%	11%	23%	27%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	3%	2%	3%	1%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	99%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	99%	99%	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.)	13%	28%	13%	20%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	3%	3%	2%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	7%	14%	7%	8%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	8%	3%	8%	4%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	24%	12%	24%	19%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	11%	6%	11%	12%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	51%	53%	51%	47%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	35%	52%	35%	51%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	72%	43%	72%	64%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	80%	84%	80%	84%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	10%	10%	10%	13%
2.4	Was the van clean?	72%	66%	72%	66%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	82%	85%	82%	84%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	84%	79%	84%	77%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	76%	78%	76%	80%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	23%	16%	23%	9%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	90%	90%	90%	94%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP North Sea Camp 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP North Sea Camp 2017	HMP North Sea Camp 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	81%	74%	81%	79%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	86%	87%	86%	86%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	92%	84%	92%	79%
When you first arrived:					
3.4	Did you have any problems?	49%	40%	49%	46%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	13%	10%	13%	11%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	11%	8%	11%	7%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	2%	2%	1%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	10%	9%	10%	8%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2%	1%	2%	0%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	9%	10%	9%	8%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	6%	4%	6%	8%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	15%	8%	15%	7%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	12%	6%	12%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	3%	1%	3%	4%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	10%	10%	10%	16%
For those with problems:					
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	58%	46%	58%	43%
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:					
3.6	Tobacco?	71%	54%	71%	70%
3.6	A shower?	55%	37%	55%	35%
3.6	A free telephone call?	22%	40%	22%	18%
3.6	Something to eat?	63%	52%	63%	40%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	59%	55%	59%	61%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	68%	43%	68%	42%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP North Sea Camp 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP North Sea Camp 2017	HMP North Sea Camp 2014
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?	66%	59%	66%	54%
3.7 Someone from health services?	88%	73%	88%	76%
3.7 A Listener/Samaritans?	58%	42%	58%	47%
3.7 Prison shop/ canteen?	38%	32%	38%	33%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8 What was going to happen to you?	72%	68%	72%	63%
3.8 Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	63%	48%	63%	47%
3.8 How to make routine requests?	65%	56%	65%	51%
3.8 Your entitlement to visits?	58%	55%	58%	43%
3.8 Health services?	79%	65%	79%	56%
3.8 The chaplaincy?	70%	57%	70%	50%
3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?	82%	92%	82%	80%
3.10 Have you been on an induction course?	97%	95%	97%	96%
For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11 Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	79%	71%	79%	71%
3.12 Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	93%	88%	93%	75%
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?	56%	56%	56%	69%
4.1 Attend legal visits?	46%	44%	46%	57%
4.2 Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	16%	24%	16%	29%
4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?	67%	46%	67%	69%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4 Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	99%	98%	99%	99%
4.4 Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	91%	66%	91%	74%
4.4 Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	65%	64%	65%	52%
4.4 Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	79%	78%	79%	82%
4.4 Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	56%	44%	56%	42%
4.5 Is the food in this prison good/very good?	87%	37%	87%	83%
4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	72%	56%	72%	54%
4.7 Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	87%	60%	87%	71%
4.8 Are your religious beliefs respected?	53%	56%	53%	53%
4.9 Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	65%	66%	65%	54%
4.10 Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	56%	57%	56%	55%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP North Sea Camp 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP North Sea Camp 2017	HMP North Sea Camp 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	89%	85%	89%	88%
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	83%	71%	83%	56%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	63%	60%	63%	44%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	59%	51%	59%	58%
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	45%	38%	45%	41%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	40%	40%	40%	42%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	14%	16%	14%	22%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	52%	38%	52%	51%
SECTION 6: Relationships with staff					
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	93%	80%	93%	80%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	90%	78%	90%	80%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	42%	32%	42%	41%
6.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	28%	20%	28%	30%
6.5	Do you have a personal officer?	89%	73%	89%	91%
	For those with a personal officer:				
6.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	76%	73%	76%	68%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP North Sea Camp 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP North Sea Camp 2017	HMP North Sea Camp 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 7: Safety					
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	29%	18%	29%	33%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	9%	7%	9%	15%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	23%	14%	23%	28%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
7.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	5%	10%	13%
7.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	1%	2%	3%
7.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	0%	2%	0%
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	7%	14%	18%
7.5	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	1%	2%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	1%	2%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	2%	3%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	2%	3%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	1%	5%	4%
7.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	0%	2%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	4%	1%	4%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	1%	3%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	2%	2%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	13%	2%	13%	13%
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	1%	1%	0%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMP North Sea Camp 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP North Sea Camp 2017	HMP North Sea Camp 2014
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
SECTION 7: Safety continued					
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	17%	20%	17%	20%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	5%	7%	5%	7%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	0%	0%	1%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%	0%	2%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	9%	10%	9%
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	3%	1%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	2%	1%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	1%	1%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%	0%	1%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	0%	1%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	1%	3%	1%	4%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5%	2%	5%	7%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	0%	0%	0%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
7.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	40%	26%	40%	41%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP North Sea Camp 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP North Sea Camp 2017	HMP North Sea Camp 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Health services					
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	44%	50%	44%	55%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	81%	70%	81%	76%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	8%	27%	8%	19%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
8.2	The doctor?	68%	65%	68%	64%
8.2	The nurse?	77%	72%	77%	85%
8.2	The dentist?	35%	56%	35%	50%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	68%	63%	68%	66%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	69%	46%	69%	53%
	For those currently taking medication:				
8.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	100%	98%	100%	97%
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	28%	15%	28%	24%
	For those who have problems:				
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	82%	58%	82%	85%
SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol					
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	8%	11%	8%	16%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	11%	10%	11%	20%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	24%	37%	24%	42%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	14%	21%	14%	24%
9.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	1%	2%	1%	5%
9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	1%	2%	1%	1%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
9.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	94%	83%	94%	82%
9.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	100%	86%	100%	78%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
9.9	Was the support helpful?	92%	90%	92%	93%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP North Sea Camp 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP North Sea Camp 2017	HMP North Sea Camp 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 10: Activities					
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:					
10.1	A prison job?	80%	75%	80%	80%
10.1	Vocational or skills training?	54%	58%	54%	57%
10.1	Education (including basic skills)?	64%	72%	64%	79%
10.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	17%	33%	17%	25%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:					
10.2	A prison job?	84%	72%	84%	82%
10.2	Vocational or skills training?	18%	17%	18%	19%
10.2	Education (including basic skills)?	20%	22%	20%	19%
10.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	2%	5%	2%	3%
10.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	96%	94%	96%	94%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:					
10.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	54%	43%	54%	57%
10.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	82%	81%	82%	84%
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:					
10.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	69%	61%	69%	80%
10.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	83%	85%	83%	84%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:					
10.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	66%	59%	66%	74%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	61%	72%	61%	60%
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?	42%	47%	42%	66%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	73%	54%	73%	70%
10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	81%	60%	81%	75%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	37%	51%	37%	39%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	85%	74%	85%	88%
10.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	77%	77%	77%	84%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	59%	56%	59%	57%
SECTION 11: Friends and family					
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	62%	56%	62%	50%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	19%	18%	19%	25%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	24%	12%	24%	13%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	20%	42%	20%	23%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP North Sea Camp 2017	Open 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		

HMP North Sea Camp 2017	HMP North Sea Camp 2014
----------------------------	----------------------------

SECTION 12: Preparation for release

	HMP North Sea Camp 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP North Sea Camp 2017	HMP North Sea Camp 2014
12.1 Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	98%	94%	98%	95%
For those who have an offender manager what type of contact have you had:				
12.2 No contact?	14%	15%	14%	19%
12.2 Contact by letter?	47%	36%	47%	56%
12.2 Contact by phone?	76%	59%	76%	64%
12.2 Contact by visit?	27%	38%	27%	39%
12.3 Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	96%	94%	96%	89%
12.4 Do you have a sentence plan?	87%	82%	87%	86%
For those with a sentence plan:				
12.5 Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	73%	75%	73%	75%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
12.6 Nobody?	19%	25%	19%	31%
12.6 Offender supervisor?	73%	63%	73%	55%
12.6 Offender manager?	56%	41%	56%	50%
12.6 Named/ personal officer?	37%	19%	37%	26%
12.6 Staff from other departments?	28%	18%	28%	30%
For those with a sentence plan:				
12.7 Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	74%	78%	74%	72%
12.8 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	10%	12%	10%	9%
12.9 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	58%	46%	58%	62%
12.10 Do you have a needs based custody plan?	8%	6%	8%	7%
12.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	49%	37%	49%	41%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:				
12.12 Employment?	44%	53%	44%	62%
12.12 Accommodation?	45%	48%	45%	49%
12.12 Benefits?	41%	49%	41%	48%
12.12 Finances?	37%	41%	37%	49%
12.12 Education?	51%	54%	51%	67%
12.12 Drugs and alcohol?	54%	58%	54%	72%
Have you been provided with information on the following:				
12.13 Resettlement day release?	71%	74%	71%	59%
12.13 Resettlement overnight release?	61%	71%	61%	56%
Have you had access to the following:				
12.14 Resettlement day release?	50%	62%	50%	49%
12.14 Resettlement overnight release?	29%	47%	29%	33%
12.14 Special purpose leave?	45%	30%	45%	42%
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:				
12.15 Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	36%	28%	36%	24%
12.15 Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	30%	30%	30%	33%
12.15 Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	81%	78%	81%	74%
12.15 Have you been on a preparation for release course?	13%	18%	13%	24%
12.15 Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	19%	48%	19%	27%
12.15 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	61%	62%	61%	66%

Diversity analysis



Key Question Responses (ethnicity) HMP North Sea Camp 2017

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
	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		25	161
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	4%	3%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	93%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	96%	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.)		
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	42%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	4%	28%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	13%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	44%	52%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	73%	86%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	76%	76%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	69%	88%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	80%	94%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	62%	47%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	92%	87%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	76%	83%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	100%	97%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	57%	56%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	99%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	76%	88%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	45%	76%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	86%	86%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	76%	49%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	84%	62%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	87%	90%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	56%	59%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	87%	94%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	76%	93%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	21%	29%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	87%	89%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	40%	28%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	13%	9%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	20%	23%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	7%	15%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	13%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	13%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	4%	3%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	21%	16%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	13%	10%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	8%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	8%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	4%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	4%	1%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	34%	45%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	57%	85%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	60%	71%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	13%	31%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	22%	25%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	79%	85%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	17%	18%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	38%	18%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	4%	2%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	87%	71%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	66%	32%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	71%	87%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	83%	76%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	66%	57%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	18%	19%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	36%	22%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
12.12	Resettlement day release?	66%	71%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	55%	62%
	Have you had access to the following:		
12.13	Resettlement day release?	61%	49%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	31%	29%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	33%	47%
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:		
12.14	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	38%	36%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	50%	27%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were closed conditions?	76%	83%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	25%	11%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	0%	22%

Diversity analysis



Key Question Responses (disability, over 50) HMP North Sea Camp 2017

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

		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		45	141	73	112
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	4%	1%	4%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%	100%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	2%	17%	6%	19%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	3%	1%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	4%	8%	3%	10%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			34%	17%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	15%	10%	20%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	42%	53%	40%	57%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	85%	83%	86%	83%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	82%	74%	78%	75%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	89%	85%	89%	84%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	93%	92%	93%	92%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	69%	43%	48%	50%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	87%	88%	91%	86%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	85%	81%	84%	81%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	98%	97%	98%	97%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	76%	49%	67%	48%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	99%	100%	98%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	89%	86%	92%	83%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	78%	70%	78%	68%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	87%	87%	92%	83%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	63%	50%	59%	48%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	67%	65%	71%	60%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	89%	90%	91%	88%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	63%	58%	66%	54%

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				
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	96%	93%	98%	90%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	91%	90%	93%	88%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	35%	25%	30%	26%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	89%	89%	88%	89%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	40%	26%	23%	32%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	13%	8%	10%	8%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	41%	17%	18%	26%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	30%	9%	9%	17%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	4%	2%	4%	2%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	4%	2%	3%	3%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	2%	0%	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	1%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	7%	1%	1%	4%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	16%	16%	11%	20%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	14%	9%	10%	10%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	1%	1%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	1%	1%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	2%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	0%	0%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	2%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	50%	41%	51%	38%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	93%	78%	86%	78%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	89%	63%	86%	57%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	58%	19%	26%	28%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	39%	20%	19%	28%

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				
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	77%	87%	81%	86%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	13%	19%	14%	20%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	16%	22%	22%	19%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	2%	2%	4%	1%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	62%	78%	75%	72%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	13%	44%	23%	46%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	90%	83%	90%	82%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	72%	78%	77%	76%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	51%	61%	56%	60%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	10%	22%	10%	25%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	23%	24%	14%	31%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:				
12.12	Resettlement day release?	81%	68%	71%	70%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	80%	55%	61%	61%
	Have you had access to the following:				
12.13	Resettlement day release?	55%	49%	52%	50%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	37%	26%	29%	29%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	58%	41%	46%	45%
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:				
12.14	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	35%	36%	39%	33%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	35%	29%	28%	31%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were closed conditions?	81%	81%	91%	76%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	14%	13%	8%	15%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	19%	19%	22%	17%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (veteran) HMP North Sea Camp 2017

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

		Consider themselves to be a veteran	Do not consider themselves to be a veteran
	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		20	165
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	3%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
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.)	0%	15%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	8%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	34%	23%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	50%	51%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	91%	84%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	75%	76%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	96%	84%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	95%	92%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	66%	47%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	95%	87%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	80%	82%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	96%	98%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	59%	55%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	99%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	91%	86%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	80%	71%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	91%	86%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	52%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	71%	64%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	84%	90%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	41%	61%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be a veteran	Do not consider themselves to be a veteran
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	91%	93%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	84%	91%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	31%	27%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	91%	88%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	34%	29%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	16%	9%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	30%	22%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	25%	12%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	3%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	5%	3%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By Prisoners)	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	3%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	9%	18%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	9%	10%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	1%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	55%	42%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	80%	81%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	66%	69%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	46%	26%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	25%	24%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be a veteran	Do not consider themselves to be a veteran
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	80%	84%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	21%	18%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	25%	20%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	3%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	66%	75%
10.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	25%	38%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	90%	85%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	78%	76%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	52%	59%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	17%	20%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	10%	26%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
12.12	Resettlement day release?	69%	71%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	52%	62%
	Have you had access to the following:		
12.13	Resettlement day release?	63%	48%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	31%	27%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	57%	43%
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:		
12.14	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	43%	35%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	21%	31%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were closed conditions?	74%	82%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	0%	15%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	31%	18%

Wing analysis



Prisoner survey responses (wing analysis) HMP North Sea Camp 2017

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Jubilee Units 2, 3, 4 and 5	All other units
	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		26	161
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	0%
1.3	Are you on recall?	0%	3%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	1%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	31%	21%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	3%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
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.	19%	13%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	4%	8%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	19%	6%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	19%	25%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	7%	11%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	50%	51%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	26%	36%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	69%	72%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	75%	81%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	9%	10%
2.4	Was the van clean?	77%	71%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	93%	81%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	88%	83%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	81%	76%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	23%	22%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	81%	91%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Jubilee Units 2, 3, 4 and 5	All other units
	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?	65%	84%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	88%	85%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	97%	92%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	42%	50%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	7%	13%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	16%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	4%	2%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	12%	9%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	2%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	7%	9%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	7%	6%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	16%	15%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	12%	12%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	4%	3%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	12%	10%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	54%	58%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	69%	71%
3.6	A shower?	58%	55%
3.6	A free telephone call?	31%	20%
3.6	Something to eat?	61%	63%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	50%	61%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	65%	69%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Jubilee Units 2, 3, 4 and 5	All other units
	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?	74%	65%
3.7	Someone from health services?	81%	89%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	61%	58%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	42%	37%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	76%	72%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	71%	62%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	71%	64%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	62%	58%
3.8	Health services?	87%	77%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	79%	68%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	84%	82%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	100%	97%
	For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	88%	77%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	97%	93%
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?	64%	55%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	69%	43%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	19%	16%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	58%	69%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	99%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	84%	92%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	93%	60%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	88%	77%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	69%	54%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	80%	88%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	74%	71%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	93%	85%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	53%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	64%	65%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	52%	56%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Jubilee Units 2, 3, 4 and 5	All other units
	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?	93%	89%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	92%	82%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	59%	64%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	77%	56%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	65%	41%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	50%	38%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	8%	15%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	54%	52%
SECTION 6: Relationships with staff			
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	97%	93%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	97%	89%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	39%	43%
6.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	23%	28%
6.5	Do you have a personal officer?	100%	87%
	For those with a personal officer:		
6.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	88%	74%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Jubilee Units 2, 3, 4 and 5	All other units
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 7: Safety			
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	31%	29%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	7%	10%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	31%	22%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
7.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	19%	9%
7.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	7%	1%
7.5	Sexually abused you?	4%	1%
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	19%	13%
7.5	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	16%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	7%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	19%	12%
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Jubilee Units 2, 3, 4 and 5	All other units
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 7: Safety continued			
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	20%	16%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	0%	5%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	0%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	10%
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	5%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	0%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
7.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	32%	42%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Jubilee Units 2, 3, 4 and 5	All other units
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Health services			
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	31%	46%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	88%	80%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	12%	7%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:		
8.2	The doctor?	73%	67%
8.2	The nurse?	74%	78%
8.2	The dentist?	33%	35%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	76%	67%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	61%	70%
	For those currently taking medication:		
8.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	100%	100%
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	16%	30%
	For those who have problems:		
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	82%	81%
SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol			
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	12%	8%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	20%	10%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	19%	25%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	16%	14%
9.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	1%
9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	0%	1%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
9.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	100%	93%
9.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	100%	100%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
9.9	Was the support helpful?	100%	90%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Jubilee Units 2, 3, 4 and 5	All other units
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 10: Activities			
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:			
10.1	A prison job?	88%	78%
10.1	Vocational or skills training?	65%	52%
10.1	Education (including basic skills)?	69%	63%
10.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	21%	16%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:			
10.2	A prison job?	81%	85%
10.2	Vocational or skills training?	12%	19%
10.2	Education (including basic skills)?	7%	22%
10.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	4%	2%
10.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	100%	95%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:			
10.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	71%	51%
10.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	96%	80%
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:			
10.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	79%	67%
10.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	100%	80%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:			
10.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	63%	66%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	84%	57%
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?	47%	41%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	74%	74%
10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	88%	80%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	35%	38%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	84%	85%
10.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	77%	77%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	74%	56%
SECTION 11: Friends and family			
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	61%	63%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	19%	19%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	16%	26%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	19%	20%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Jubilee Units 2, 3, 4 and 5	All other units
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 12: Preparation for release			
12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	97%	99%
	For those who have an offender manager what type of contact have you had:		
12.2	No contact?	7%	15%
12.2	Contact by letter?	53%	47%
12.2	Contact by phone?	87%	74%
12.2	Contact by visit?	40%	25%
12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	100%	95%
12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	96%	86%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
12.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	64%	74%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:		
12.6	Nobody?	13%	20%
12.6	Offender supervisor?	76%	72%
12.6	Offender manager?	73%	53%
12.6	Named/ personal officer?	56%	33%
12.6	Staff from other departments?	47%	24%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	84%	72%
12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	7%	11%
12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	67%	56%
12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	7%	9%
12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	76%	45%
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:		
12.12	Employment?	52%	42%
12.12	Accommodation?	43%	45%
12.12	Benefits?	43%	41%
12.12	Finances?	33%	38%
12.12	Education?	61%	50%
12.12	Drugs and alcohol?	74%	49%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
12.13	Resettlement day release?	96%	67%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	81%	58%
	Have you had access to the following:		
12.14	Resettlement day release?	92%	44%
12.14	Resettlement overnight release?	65%	22%
12.14	Special purpose leave?	76%	40%
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:		
12.15	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	31%	36%
12.15	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	44%	28%
12.15	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	93%	80%
12.15	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	21%	12%
12.15	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	21%	19%
12.15	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	76%	58%