

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP Hewell

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

7–18 July 2014

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.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

Crown copyright 2014

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Where we have identified any third party copyright material 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
Victory House
6th floor
30–34 Kingsway
London
WC2B 6EX
England

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	33
Section 3. Purposeful activity	49
Section 4. Resettlement	55
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	63
Section 6. Appendices	71
Appendix I: Inspection team	71
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	73
Appendix IIIa: Prison population profile – closed site	81
Appendix IIIb: Prison population profile – open site	85
Appendix IVa: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews – closed site	87
Appendix IVb: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews – open site	103

Introduction

HMP Hewell is predominately a local prison situated in Worcestershire and serving courts in the West Midlands. In 2008, it merged with a nearby, well established open prison to create a combined facility holding just over 1,300 prisoners, approximately 200 of whom are held in open conditions. Situated in a rural setting, it is a prison of contrasts: the local part is a relatively modern establishment which was built around 20 years ago, while the open element is located in a 19th century country house formerly known as Hewell Grange. We inspected the establishment as a whole but, because of the distinct nature of the two sides of the prison, we have assessed them separately.

When we last visited Hewell in early 2013 we found a prison that was still recovering from the escape of a prisoner under escort, with significant management turnover and staff who were lacking in motivation. At this inspection, we found limited progress and deterioration in some areas; and many basic systems that greatly impacted prisoners simply did not work.

In our survey, prisoners at both the closed and open sites reported feeling less safe and more victimised than prisoners at comparable prisons. Arrangements to receive and induct prisoners were often chaotic. We were not assured that all new arrivals were fully assessed and it was wrong that prisoners bound for the open site were routinely strip-searched and had to spend their first night locked up in the closed site. It is often the case that prisoners arriving at establishments wait too long before receiving their first shop order: this was an acute problem at Hewell where failing systems were leading directly to needless frustration, prisoner debt, bullying and violence.

On the closed site there were significant levels of violence, some of it very serious - there had been a murder in early 2013. Arrangements to confront violence and investigate incidents were inadequate to the task and we were not persuaded that the prison was aware of all incidents. We found little evidence of specific threats to safety on the open site, but prisoners' perceptions of insecurity needed further investigation.

Since the last inspection the prison had experienced six self-inflicted deaths, all on the closed site. High numbers of prisoners were considered to be at risk of self-harm and the number of recorded incidents of self-harm was high. Case management of those in crisis was reasonable and prisoners at risk felt reasonably well cared for. However, it was again concerning that a number of prisoners felt they could only resolve issues, such as access to basic amenities, by self-harming.

Security was applied proportionately at both sites but there was evidence to suggest that illicit drugs or diverted prescription medications were readily available in the closed site. Substance misuse services were appreciated by prisoners but undermined by staff shortages. Use of force was increasing and use of special accommodation was too high. Administrative arrangements to ensure accountability concerning the use of force required greater rigour. The segregation unit was shabby, the regime was limited and re-integration planning was unsophisticated. Staff were, however, supportive and the majority of prisoners were segregated for relatively short periods.

Cleanliness had improved from the very poor conditions we observed at our last inspection but there was still too much graffiti. Some 40% of cells were overcrowded. Dormitories on the open site remained cramped and in need of cleaning and decoration. The provision of many basic services such as clothing, cleaning materials and mail were all problematic and cell call bells were not answered quickly. Prisoners were frustrated by their inability to get simple applications dealt with effectively and, as a consequence, the formal complaints system was being used to deal with low-level issues. Of particular concern was that a number of complaints, including some serious allegations against staff, had been investigated poorly or, in some cases, not at all.

Most prisoners were positive about the levels of respect shown by staff but structures to encourage consultation were weak. Work to promote equality was mixed. The identification of prisoners with protected characteristics was reasonable but concerns were not effectively addressed and consultation with minority groups was poor. There was a good range of primary health care and satisfactory inpatient and mental health provision, but health services were impacted by staff shortages, poor access to GP clinics and the frequent cancellation of hospital appointments. The administration of medications also required improvement.

There was much work to do to improve the quality of work, education and training, particularly in the closed site. There was sufficient activity for prisoners in the open site but not enough on the closed site. At both sites there was underutilisation of what was available. During spot checks we found well over half of all prisoners in the closed site locked in their cells during the working day and many, especially wing domestic workers, were underemployed. About 280 prisoners were recorded as unemployed. The range of accredited vocational training was adequate but the quality of teaching at both sites was inconsistent. A significant number of prisoners from the open site were able to access work, education and training on temporary release.

The prison had a reasonably good strategy to deliver resettlement and work across the resettlement pathways was mostly good with some meaningful outcomes, notably in respect of housing, family ties and restorative justice. The quality of offender management work was much weaker; it was poorly organised and under-resourced at both sites. Contact between prisoners and their supervisors was infrequent, there was a backlog of OASys assessments and quality assurance of assessments was poor. Half the assessments we reviewed had no risk management plan and assessments were not reviewed for those prisoners newly arrived at the open site. This was particularly concerning as it had the potential to impact on the thoroughness of risk assessments prior to decisions to release prisoners on temporary licence.

Hewell continues to face real difficulties. We identified substantial safety concerns on the closed site and there was much to do to make it a more respectful place. Resettlement was not good enough on both sites. The prison was not doing the basics properly, as evidenced by poor access to the shop and other amenities, a weak applications system and poor investigation of sometimes very serious complaints. The frustration this created for prisoners was evident in negative outcomes such as bullying and self-harm. The prison had strengths, including good relationships between staff and prisoners, but these needed to be harnessed to greater purpose. A new governor had begun to address basic service provision. A methodical, systematic and incremental approach to the prison's problems was needed and this process had started.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

November 2014

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Category B local male prison and a category D open male prison.

Prison status

Public

Region

West Midlands

Number held

1,308 (1,104 closed site, 204 open site)

Certified normal accommodation

1,003

Operational capacity

1,261

Date of last full inspection

November 2012

Brief history

HMP Hewell was officially opened on 25 June 2008. It consists of a closed category B male site and an open category D male site. House blocks 1-6 form the local function of the group holding remand (including potential category A prisoners), sentenced and vulnerable prisoners. The Grange Resettlement Unit, a grade II* listed manor house built in 1894, is the category D open site.

Short description of residential units

Closed site

The six house blocks have a combination of single and double cells, all with in-cell sanitation.

House blocks 1, 2 A spur and 3	predominantly convicted prisoners; resettlement focus.
House block 4	prisoners with drug or alcohol issues.
House blocks 5, 2 B spur	vulnerable prisoners.
House block 2 C spur	restorative justice spur.
House block 6	induction/first night unit.

The Grange Resettlement Unit

A large three-storey house with dormitory accommodation of varying sizes for standard and enhanced category D male prisoners. There is also a hostel in an annex and a small community hostel in the grounds (Harwood House) for suitable selected applicants.

Name of governor

Nigel Atkinson – Closed site

Nick Dann – Open site

Escort contractor

GEOAmev

Health service provider

Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust

Learning and skills provider

Milton Keynes College

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Tony Roper

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 the National Offender Management Service.

- **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
 - **housekeeping points:** achievable within a matter of days, or at most weeks, through the issue of instructions or changing routines
 - **examples of good practice:** impressive practice that not only meets or exceeds our expectations, but could be followed by other similar establishments to achieve positive outcomes for prisoners.
- 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, unless these have already been reviewed by a short follow-up inspection.

This report

- A8 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, housekeeping points 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.
- A9 Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and III respectively.
- A10 Findings from the survey of prisoners and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix IV 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 0.05, which means that there is only a 5% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

Summary

Safety

- S1** *There were significant weaknesses in reception, first night and induction processes. Prisoners reported high levels of victimisation and we were not confident about the accuracy of data on violent incidents. Some serious allegations had been poorly investigated on the closed site. There were a high number of self-harm incidents. Security measures were generally proportionate. Reintegration planning for a minority of difficult cases in the segregation unit lacked sophistication. Force was used proportionately, but governance of special accommodation was weak. Mandatory drug testing (MDT) positive rates on the closed site were high and prescribing practices were poor. There was no evidence of significant safety concerns on the open site. **Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were poor for the closed site and reasonably good for the open site.***
- S2** *At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Hewell were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 20 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved, and 11 had not been achieved.*
- S3** In our survey, most prisoners were positive about their treatment by escort staff, and the escort vehicles we inspected were clean. Prisoners were transferred from escort vehicles to reception reasonably quickly. All new arrivals were routinely strip searched, even those on their way to the open site. Some new arrivals bound for the open site also had to stay at the closed site overnight, which was inappropriate. The reception process could be slow and prisoners often waited for several hours in bare holding rooms.
- S4** Some first night cells were poorly prepared. The first night and induction unit could be a chaotic environment where staff were unable to provide adequate supervision or support. Not all new arrivals received first night assessments or induction. Prisoner peer resettlement workers provided good support to arrivals in reception. Prisoners going to the open site did not have an adequate introduction to open conditions.
- S5** In our survey, more prisoners than the comparator said they felt unsafe, and they reported high levels of victimisation. There had been some serious violent incidents, including a murder. Prisoner-on-prisoner assaults were high. Some violent and bullying incidents were not centrally recorded or managed through violence reduction procedures. We were very concerned to find several allegations of assault by staff that had not been investigated adequately or, in some cases, at all. Bullying and violent incidents were often linked to debt, which in turn was related to delays for new arrivals in receiving their first orders from the prison shop, especially tobacco. Violent incident investigations were of variable quality, and violence reduction procedures generally lacked rigour. Reported violent incidents and bullying were rare on the open site, although prisoners said there were high levels of victimisation by other prisoners.
- S6** There had been six self-inflicted deaths since the last inspection. Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations were being worked on but progress had been too slow on some of them. On the closed site, the numbers of open assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents was high and increasing. Staff did not always have time to interact meaningfully with prisoners in crisis. The number of self-harm incidents was reducing but still higher than at similar closed prisons. ACCT assessments

suggested that a number of prisoners had self-harmed because their concerns – often about their shop orders or medications – were not being resolved in other ways. Prisoners at risk generally reported that they were reasonably well cared for. However, while some ACCT assessments were very good, reviews were not sufficiently multidisciplinary and care maps and post-closure reviews were not always completed. Two constant watch cells were inappropriately located in the segregation unit.

- S7 Security measures were generally proportionate on both sites. A significant amount of security information was analysed well but target searching was not always carried out quickly, and objectives did not always reflect current concerns. Attendance at security meetings was poor, and security staff did not attend other relevant meetings frequently enough. The random positive MDT rate was high. Most weekend random tests and some suspicion tests were not completed. Prisoners told us that illicit drugs and prescribed medications were easily available on the closed site, and a significant proportion of prisoners in our survey, 17%, said they had developed a drug problem in the prison. On the open site, there was no risk drug testing before or after release on temporary licence. The abscond rate was low.
- S8 Staff said they often did not record incentives and earned privileges (IEP) entries on prisoner behaviour because they did not have the time. Some reviews of basic-level prisoners were poor. In our survey, prisoners were negative about the fairness and effectiveness of the scheme. Trends were not effectively monitored.
- S9 The number of adjudications had increased since our previous inspection and was high for the type of prison. The adjudications we saw were fair and records showed that full investigations were carried out. Punishments were proportionate. There were no significant problems of order or discipline on the open site. However, collective punishments were inappropriately threatened and had been carried out on the open site at least once.
- S10 Use of force had increased, but was not high for the type of prison. Use of full restraint had reduced, but still accounted for half of all incidents. Monitoring had recently been reintroduced but there had been little analysis and quality assurance was infrequent. Documentation gave some assurance that prisoners were restrained as a last resort, and de-escalation during restraint was often evident. Planned interventions were not routinely video-recorded. Use of special accommodation was high, poorly documented and not all prisoners were moved quickly enough after they become compliant.
- S11 Most segregated prisoners remained there for short periods, but a significant minority had been there for a long time. Reintegration planning lacked drive and sophistication for some of the more difficult cases. Some unit cells were grubby and had graffiti. The regime was inadequate, but staff interacted well with the prisoners. There had been no analysis of information on segregation use.
- S12 Substance misuse services were appreciated by prisoners, but had been badly affected by clinical staff shortages. Many prisoners did not receive clinical reviews for opiate substitution treatment and too many were on maintenance doses. Peer supporters were frequently not unlocked by discipline staff to help other prisoners in crisis. Prisoners on the open site had better access to peer supporters but there were no Alcoholics Anonymous meetings there.

Respect

- S13** *Cleanliness was improving across both sites. There was a significant problem of overcrowding. Prisoners were generally treated with respect but staff lacked time to engage with them. Equality work was underdeveloped and there was inadequate support for some groups. Faith provision was good. There was poor governance of the confidential access complaints procedure and too many general complaints were for low-level matters. There were significant weaknesses in health services. Food was reasonable and prisoners could dine in association. The ineffective shop system created significant risks.. **Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were not sufficiently good for the closed site and reasonably good for the open site.***
- S14** *At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Hewell were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 25 recommendations in the area of respect.² At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, seven had been partially achieved, 12 had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*
- S15** Cleanliness around the prison had recently improved, but there was still too much dirt, and some house blocks were shabby. Dormitories and communal areas in the open site needed redecoration and deep cleaning. Some showers had been redecorated but others were still well below standard. Nearly 40% of cells held more prisoners than they were designed for, and some dormitories in the open site were cramped. There was graffiti in several areas, some of it offensive. There were problems with basic services, such as clothing, cleaning materials and the mail. Officers were persistently very slow to answer cell call bells and there was no tracking data. The applications system was not working well and considerably frustrating for prisoners; managers were aware of this but there was no clear improvement plan as yet.
- S16** In our survey, most prisoners were positive about respect and support from staff. However, staff were often too busy to respond to prisoners' requests, and prisoners on the open site complained that staff deployed there from the closed site did not adjust their approach accordingly. Prisoner consultation meetings were poorly attended by key staff and issues were often raised repeatedly before they were addressed.
- S17** Regular equality meetings had not led to tangible progress and monitoring data were not always collected or discussed. Investigation of the small number of discrimination complaints was poor, some had not been replied to and many replies were late. Identification of protected characteristics was reasonably good. Staff had insufficient time to follow up and address issues. There were no support or consultation forums for groups with protected characteristics. Some detainees were held for long periods beyond the end of their sentence in restrictive prison conditions. There were some adaptations for prisoners with physical disabilities. Older prisoners had access to appropriate wing-based activities and were unlocked for much of the time. However, a number of older and disabled prisoners struggled with daily tasks and there was no formal carer scheme or care plans.
- S18** The chaplaincy was prominent in the life of the prison and there were good opportunities to attend services. Areas for worship were generally appropriate.
- S19** There was a legal services officer and bail information, but legal services did not meet the need and officers were untrained. Legal visits facilities were reasonable and there was regular

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.

use of the video-link service, but the prisoners' waiting area was cramped and their toilets had little privacy.

- S20 Some confidential access complaints had been inadequately investigated, and in the previous six months over a quarter had not been replied to at all. This was particularly concerning given some serious allegations of staff assaults. There was a high number of general complaints, and prisoners resorted to the complaints system for low-level issues that should have been resolved by wing staff. Many prisoners had little confidence in the system. Most non-confidential complaints were dealt with in a respectful and appropriate manner with quality assurance in place, but there were some long delays in responses. There were few complaints on the open site.
- S21 Health services had been affected by staff vacancies and sickness. Access to GP clinics on both sites was poor, with waits of up to six weeks. There was a good range of primary care and screening clinics but too many outside hospital appointments were cancelled. Referrals to outside hospitals were also high, disrupting the regime as wing staff were required for escorting duties. Some prisoners were inappropriately located on the inpatient unit for non-clinical reasons. Inpatient care was satisfactory but the environment was not sufficiently therapeutic. Medicines administration was inadequately supervised, and prisoners did not have adequate access to a pharmacist. There were some long delays in prisoners getting their medication. Access to the dentist on the closed site was satisfactory but there were long waiting times for routine appointments on the open site. Prisoners received adequate mental health care.
- S22 The food appeared reasonable, but many prisoners on the closed site were unhappy with the quality and quantity. Prisoner consultation had not led to meaningful improvement. Prisoners helped in food preparation and serving and could obtain accredited catering qualifications. There was space for only a minority of prisoners on both sites to eat communally. Prisoners had to wait far too long between order and delivery of their shop goods, and new arrivals had unacceptable delays. Items regularly went missing and prisoners had no trust in the system, which was creating frustration, debt and bullying.

Purposeful activity

S23 *Too many prisoners on the closed site were locked in cells during the core working day. The variety of education and vocational training was adequate across both sites. There were too few activity places on the closed site and they were not fully used. Management of learning and skills was inadequate across both sites, although improving. Participation in PE and access to the library were generally good on both sites. **Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were not sufficiently good on the closed site and reasonably good on the open site.***

S24 *At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Hewell were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 10 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved, and four had not been achieved.*

S25 Prisoners in part-time work or education were unlocked on a normal working day for up to 7.5 hours. However, we found more than half of prisoners locked up during the peak working periods. There was routine locking up of each house block for one morning or afternoon period every weekend. There was a maximum of only half an hour's exercise a day, and those in full-time work had no exercise on weekdays.

- S26 Actions to address key learning and skills issues identified at the previous inspection had been slow, and management of provision had not been good enough on either site. Data analysis and use of management information was particularly poor. Quality improvement processes were weak.
- S27 The variety of education programmes and vocational training courses was adequate across both sites, but there were insufficient progression opportunities, particularly for longer term prisoners. Jobs for vulnerable prisoners were limited. The process to allocate prisoners to activity was suitable but there was insufficient use of individual action plans produced by the National Careers Service. There were not enough activity places for all prisoners on the closed site, and places that were available were not fully used. Too many prisoners in wing jobs on both sites were under-occupied.
- S28 The overall quality of teaching, coaching and learning was variable. Achievement rates for those who stayed on courses were generally high, but overall attendance and punctuality were exceptionally poor. Prisoners in vocational areas demonstrated good practical skills. The standard of work in education was satisfactory and, in some cases, good. Success rates in English, maths and English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) were variable.
- S29 The library provision on both sites was well managed with adequate stock on the closed site and a wide variety of materials on the open site. Access for vulnerable prisoners was now adequate with plans to improve it further. The library provided a suitable range of additional activities, such as the Shannon Trust reading mentoring project and Storybook Dads (enabling prisoners to record bedtime stories for their children)
- S30 PE was well managed and staff were enthusiastic. PE facilities on both sites were generally good. Access to recreational PE for prisoners on both sites was adequate, but the provision was too often closed when staff were cross-deployed for wing duties. There was an appropriate range of PE vocational courses and qualification pass rates were high. Promotion of healthy living was good and there were effective links with health care.

Resettlement

S31 *Strategic management of resettlement was reasonably good. Offender management was poor across both sites and offender supervisors were unable to work effectively with prisoners. There were significant weaknesses in public protection work. Prisoner resettlement peer workers helped prisoners with practical needs. There was some innovative and effective work across most resettlement pathways. **Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were not sufficiently good on both sites.***

S32 *At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Hewell were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made eight recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that none of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved, six had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

S33 There was a good strategy for reducing reoffending based on information about the needs of the population, and it included appropriate development objectives. There was no corresponding strategy for offender management. Community agencies involved in delivery of resettlement objectives were included in the development and oversight of resettlement initiatives, and there were links with local integrated offender management projects. There had been some useful work to prepare for the transition of Hewell to a designated resettlement prison.

- S34 Offender management unit staff on both sites were poorly organised and often redeployed. Too many offender assessment system (OASys) reviews were overdue and few prisoners had purposeful contact with an offender supervisor. There were no clear systems for allocating and monitoring work. In OASys assessments, risk management planning was absent or of poor quality, and sentence plans did not drive work with prisoners.
- S35 ROTL was an important part of the resettlement strategy on the open site and prisoners were involved in a range of community work, paid work and college placements. Assessments took a considered view of risk, but in many cases there was insufficient OASys information to inform release on temporary licence (ROTL) decision-making, and multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) levels were not routinely checked. Some elements of public protection arrangements were poor. Home detention curfew processes were generally sound but suffered from lack of OASys data. Categorisation reviews were mostly on time and prisoners were fully informed of the reasons for decisions. There was little provision for indeterminate sentence prisoners, and poor oversight of the timeliness or quality of parole submissions.
- S36 Prisoner resettlement peer workers had been recently introduced and offered very useful support to prisoners on the closed site. However, they had access to some confidential information about other prisoners and inadequate supervision by staff. There was a useful pre-release meeting.
- S37 Nacro-trained housing advisers had good links with relevant staff internally and with external accommodation services. They were well trained to address the wide range of complex problems facing prisoners on release, and undertook useful follow-up of prisoners in the community. An average of 93.5% of prisoners across both sites left to settled accommodation. There was a range of finance, benefits and debt advice on both sites, and Citizens Advice provided help with more complex problems.
- S38 Jobcentre Plus and the National Careers Service offered good advice and guidance. There were links with a variety of employers, which were used particularly well on the open site to provide ROTL opportunities and jobs for prisoners when released. There was a useful employability course for prisoners on both sites. The virtual campus (providing prisoner access to community education, training and employment opportunities via the internet) was in limited use on the closed site and had access problems on the open site.
- S39 Health care discharge planning arrangements were on time and appropriate, but prisoners with enduring mental health problems were not managed using the care programme approach. Arrangements for palliative care were well developed. Prisoners with substance misuse problems had good support before and after release.
- S40 There was a good range of innovative family interventions for prisoners and their families, including a parenting course and special family visits. The visitors' centre for the closed site offered first-time visitors a high level of support. The visits hall was large and pleasant, but the play area needed renovation. Visit starts were often delayed on the closed site. Visit arrangements were good on the open site.
- S41 The Thinking Skills Programme (TSP) and Focus on Rehabilitation (FOR) accredited programmes were run efficiently. FOR had made a good start, and over 300 prisoners had met outside agencies at a recent resettlement fair. However, the number of completions on both programmes was low. The restorative justice team worked effectively with some prisoners, and the dedicated residential landing for those who had completed the SORI (supporting offenders through rehabilitation inside) course was an effective way of embedding learning.

Main concerns and recommendations

S42 **Concern:** Prisoner-on-prisoner assaults were high and there had been some particularly serious violent incidents. Bullying and violent incidents were often linked to debt, which in turn was related to severe delays in receiving orders from the prison shop. Serious allegations of assault by staff had been investigated poorly or not at all. Violence reduction procedures generally lacked rigour.

Recommendation: **Managers should investigate and address the underlying causes of violent behaviour, including debt-related bullying. Rigorous violence reduction procedures should be in place, and all allegations of assault by staff should be investigated thoroughly and promptly, and fully recorded.**

S43 **Concern:** There was no written policy on segregation and reintegration, and a significant minority of prisoners stayed on the unit for too long with insufficient focus on their needs. The regime was poor for all prisoners held there.

Recommendation: **All prisoners in the segregation unit should have detailed care and reintegration plans, based on an initial and continuing assessment of their risks and needs, specific time-bound targets and access to as full a regime as possible.**

S44 **Concern:** Over half of prisoners on the closed site were locked behind their doors during the working day. There were too few activity places on the closed site, and even these were not fully used.

Recommendation: **Prisoners should be unlocked and engaged in constructive activity during the working day. The number and quality of employment and other activity places should be increased and fully used.**

S45 **Concern:** In many cases there was insufficient OASys information to inform release on temporary licence (ROTL) decision-making, and we were not assured that multi agency public protection arrangements (MAPPAs) levels were routinely checked before release or during consideration for ROTL.

Recommendation: **Offender assessment system (OASys) assessments for prisoners who arrive at the open site should be reviewed so that their levels of risk in open conditions are well understood and inform sentence planning and temporary release objectives. Public protection processes should include a check with the appropriate community contact of the prisoner's MAPPA risk level six months before release and during consideration for temporary 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 *Prisoners arriving at the prison generally did not have to wait long in escort vehicles before they were taken to reception. The escort vans were clean and the escort staff polite, although prisoners in our survey were negative about their treatment. Property was a major concern.*

I.2 Most prisoners arrived at Hewell from local courts after short journeys. Prisoners at both sites reported reasonably quick transfer from escort vehicles to the reception, and we did not see significant delays during the inspection. Person escort records were completed well. In our survey, on both sites fewer prisoners than the comparators said they were treated well by escort staff.

I.3 The escort vans we saw were clean. Prisoners told us they had no toilet breaks and had to use urine gel bags instead. There were persistent problems with property not coming with prisoners transferring to Hewell, and often taking up to two weeks to arrive. In our survey, prisoners on both sites were more negative than the comparators about property arriving with them and loss of property.

Recommendation

I.4 **Prisoners' property should accompany them to court and during transfer.**

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.5 *It was inappropriate that every new arrival was strip searched. Prisoners waited too long in reception and did not always receive first night assessments or induction. Resettlement peer workers and Listeners provided good support, but were inadequately supervised. First night cells were not always prepared, and night staff did not provide adequate supervision and support to new arrivals.*

I.6 The reception area was suitable but holding rooms were dirty and had graffiti scratched into the windows. New arrivals on the closed site were routinely strip searched in reception, even if they had transferred in from other prisons (see recommendation I.52). Category D prisoners bound for the open site were dealt with at the closed site first and also strip

searched. The searching area in reception was in a well-used area and only partially screened, with not enough privacy.

- I.7 New arrivals often waited for long periods in the reception holding rooms – waits of around four hours were commonly reported. The holding rooms were bare with inadequate seating for the number of prisoners waiting.
- I.8 In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparators said that they were treated well in reception on both the open site (69% against 79%) and the closed site (59% against 62%). Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) were based in reception and provided good support, reassuring new arrivals and assisting with the reception process. Peer resettlement workers also gave support through identifying areas of individual prisoner need related to the resettlement pathways and making referrals as appropriate. These workers were enthusiastic and organised but had little staff supervision, and they sometimes received personal information from other prisoners (see also paragraph 4.27 and housekeeping point 4.30).
- I.9 Reception staff carried out cell sharing risk assessments in private, which was an improvement on our previous inspection. However, not all new arrivals had a first night interview or assessment before they went to their accommodation.
- I.10 The first night unit held new arrivals, as well as other prisoners with complex needs because there was no alternative accommodation for them. During our night visit, 20 prisoners on open assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management for those at risk of suicide or self-harm were on the unit. Staff could barely keep up with the number of required observations and did little to ensure that new arrivals were settled into their cells. Cells on the first night unit were dirty, overcrowded and some not fully prepared for new arrivals. One newly arrived prisoner had to request a replacement mattress as the one in his cell was damp with urine.
- I.11 Prisoners on both sites were negative in our survey about their access to information and support on arrival, and the usefulness of the induction. A recently introduced induction programme on the closed site was well designed and presented by specially trained allocated induction officers, but it was too early to judge its effectiveness. Prisoners in the open site received no formal induction from staff. Peer advisers provided good guidance and support, but the lack of staff involvement was a significant weakness given the challenges for prisoners transferring to open conditions.

Recommendations

- I.12 **Category D new arrivals should be transferred directly to the open site and no longer accommodated on the closed site.**
- I.13 **The holding rooms in reception should be decorated, kept clean and have adequate reading material and seating, and prisoners should not be held in them for long periods.**
- I.14 **All new arrivals should receive a first night assessment and appropriate first night checks, and they should be accommodated in clean and well-prepared cells.**
- I.15 **All prisoners should receive an induction soon after arrival, and the programme for open site prisoners should include a full introduction to open conditions.**

Housekeeping points

- I.16 The reception searching area should be well screened and offer sufficient privacy.
- I.17 Peer resettlement workers should be monitored and supervised by prison staff.

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.18 *Many prisoners on both sites felt unsafe. There had been many violent incidents on the closed site since our last inspection, including a murder, and violence was often related to debt. Prisoner-on-prisoner assaults were high on the closed site. Investigations into violent incidents varied in quality, not all allegations of assault by staff were investigated, and not all violent incidents were recorded centrally. Antisocial behaviour booklets were of little value. A review of violent incidents and a prisoner survey produced some valuable learning.*

- I.19 Many prisoners in our survey said they felt unsafe. On both the open and closed sites, more prisoners than the comparators said that they had felt unsafe at some time or currently, and that they had been victimised by other prisoners. On the closed site, more prisoners than at our last inspection responded negatively to almost all the safety questions.
- I.20 In January 2013, a prisoner was murdered on the closed site, and there had been many serious violent incidents in 2014 on the closed site. Broken table legs, pool balls in socks and boiling water were used as weapons. Three prisoners were taken to hospital with suspected broken jaws following separate incidents. Some referrals were made to the police following serious incidents. We also found several instances where prisoners had alleged assault from staff, including sexual assault, that had not been adequately investigated or, in some cases, not investigated at all (see main recommendation S42).
- I.21 In the previous six months, there had been 33 fights and 13 assaults on staff on the closed site. In the same period, there had been 83 assaults on prisoners by other prisoners, which was particularly high for the type of prison. However, we were not assured that these figures represented all violent incidents, as not all incidents entered in wing observation logs were recorded centrally or known to the safer custody team. On the open site, there had been one assault but no fights, and we found little evidence of threats to physical safety.
- I.22 Staff and prisoners consistently told us that debt triggered many violent incidents and bullying on the closed site. Debt was often related to an inefficient shop process. New arrivals sometimes had to wait 17 days to receive their first shop order (see recommendation 2.118). Smokers could buy only two 12.5g packs of tobacco before they received their first shop orders, and some supplemented this by borrowing or stealing, leading to conflict. Not all prisoners had privacy keys to their cells, which would have reduced the opportunities for stealing (see recommendation 2.13).
- I.23 Bullies were managed through a range of approaches, including the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, disciplinary hearings, wing moves, segregation or monitoring. Victims were often moved to a different wing or monitored through a tackling antisocial behaviour

(TAB) support plan. Some prisoners with debt problems reported useful support from individual staff but the TAB booklets were of little value beyond alerting staff to victims and perpetrators. On the first day of our inspection, there were 24 open booklets relating to bullies and 14 support booklets, all on the closed site. In the previous six months, 201 prisoners had been monitored for antisocial behaviour, which was very high for the type of prison (see main recommendation S42). A small number of prisoners had benefited from the conflict resolution and mediation available through the SORI (supporting offenders through rehabilitation inside) course (see paragraph 4.49).

- I.24** The safer custody team – comprising a senior manager, custodial manager, administrators and a pool of officers – investigated violent incidents. The quality of the investigations varied from good to poor, and some lacked rigour. The team had completed two pieces of work on violence reduction, both of which had yielded some useful learning points. In 2012, prisoners were surveyed on their perceptions of safety, and there were plans to repeat this survey shortly after our inspection. In early 2014, the team analysed all violent incident reports from 2013 and held two prisoner focus groups.

Housekeeping points

- I.25** The safer custody team should accurately record all incidents and indicators of violence, including threats, allegations of bullying and unexplained injuries.
- I.26** The safer custody team should survey prisoners' perceptions of safety annually.

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.27 *There had been six self-inflicted deaths at the closed site since our previous inspection. The frequency of self-harm and number of open self-harm monitoring documents were high. Staff did not have enough time to interact meaningfully with prisoners in crisis. Not all Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations had been implemented. Listeners were active and supported by managers. Constant watch suites were austere. Self-harm was very rare at the open site.*

I.28 There had been six self-inflicted deaths in the closed site since our previous inspection, and a seventh prisoner committed suicide the day after his release. In the previous six months, there had been 249 self-harm incidents by 89 prisoners. The number of self-harmers was comparable to similar prisons but the frequency at which they self-harmed was much higher. A high number of prisoners on the closed site were managed through assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents. On the first day of our inspection 51 ACCTs were open, and 472 had been opened in the previous six months, which was high for the type of prison.

I.29 Staff did not always have the time to interact meaningfully with prisoners in crisis. During our night visit, we found two officers on one wing who were responsible for making observational entries once every two and half minutes, in addition to other duties (see paragraph I.10). Prisoners in crisis told us they were treated well by staff, but some said that

the underlying causes of their crisis were not remedied. Self-harm monitoring paperwork suggested that self-harm was too often related to the fact that prisoners' concerns – often about medication or shop orders – were not being resolved by other means.

- I.30** ACCT case reviews were usually completed on time but were often not multidisciplinary (see also housekeeping point 2.50). Health care staff did not attend any of the reviews we examined, although staff did telephone the mental health in-reach team for input. Assessments ranged from very good to poor. Care maps and post-closure reviews were not always completed. Many triggers for self-harm focused on past rather than future events that could prompt self-harm. Many observational entries lacked detail.
- I.31** The prison had drawn up action plans to implement recommendations of the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman following deaths in custody and had made some progress, but some recommendations remained outstanding, including the issue of cell privacy keys to reduce theft and subsequent conflicts (see recommendation 2.13).
- I.32** The monthly safer custody team meetings analysed a wide range of data to identify trends. Attendance was variable, but we observed a meeting with wide representation, including a representative from the escort contractor and Listeners. A prisoner who had been a former prolific self-harmer addressed the meeting to share his experience, and staff appeared to take valuable learning points from his contribution.
- I.33** The nine Listeners were well supported, but the three Listener suites were untidy, dirty and lacked suitable appliances and furnishings. Listeners were often called out to support prisoners who were struggling to cope while awaiting medication, often related to substance misuse. Prisoners could telephone the Samaritans from the wings.
- I.34** There were four constant watch suites, two in the health care department and two in the segregation unit. All were austere and one in the segregation unit was particularly poor and appeared to have blood on the wall. Prisoners in crisis were sometimes held in a gated cell in segregation purely to prevent self-harm, which was inappropriate. In the first six months of 2014, four prisoners on open ACCTs had been held in special accommodation; in one case, the paperwork did not justify this extreme form of custody (see also paragraph 1.73 and recommendation 1.75).
- I.35** In the previous six months, there had been no self-harm incidents or ACCTs opened on the open site.

Recommendations

- I.36** **Assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documentation should demonstrate consistent staff care for prisoners at risk of self-harm. Support arrangements should include good quality care planning and multidisciplinary reviews.**
- I.37** **The Listener suites should be in an appropriate condition and ready to accommodate a prisoner in crisis and a Listener.**
- I.38** **The gated cells in segregation should not be used solely to prevent self-harming. (Repeated recommendation 3.47)**

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.39 *The prison's safeguarding policy required minor updates. Multidisciplinary team meetings were good. There were no links with the local adult social service departments or the local safeguarding adults board.*

I.40 The prison's safeguarding policy set out how at-risk adults would be cared for. The policy required some minor updates and did not include the Department of Health's *No Secrets* definition of an at-risk adult. The head of safer custody and residential units was responsible for safeguarding throughout the prison. Weekly multidisciplinary team meetings discussed prisoners who required additional support, and were a good initiative. The prison had no regular contact with the local adult social services department or safeguarding adults board. Some local authorities had been contacted to ensure appropriate care for at-risk prisoners being discharged.

Recommendation

I.41 **The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes.**

Housekeeping point

I.42 The safeguarding policy should be updated to include the Department of Health's definition of an at-risk adult in its *No Secrets* report.

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.43 *Security measures were generally proportionate, but routine strip searching in reception and closed visits for non-visits related activity were excessive. Security information was analysed well but required actions were not always carried out quickly. Security information sharing was reasonable but the security department sometimes seemed to be working in isolation. The random mandatory drug testing rate was relatively high. Illicit drugs and prescribed medication were easily available. Most weekend random tests and some suspicion tests were not completed. On the open site, there was no testing of prisoners before or after release on temporary licence.*

I.44 Physical security measures were generally proportionate for the risks on both sites. However, routine strip searching of all new arrivals (see paragraph I.6) and use of closed visits for non-visits related activity, such as possession of a mobile telephone, were disproportionate measures. There were 33 prisoners on closed visits restrictions and 16 banned visitors. All cases were reviewed monthly, but the appeal process was not explained to prisoners and visitors. Prisoners on the closed site had well-supervised free movement to activities and were escorted at other times. Prisoner movement was unrestricted on the open site within prescribed areas. Security staff contributed to prisoners' risk assessments for activities.

I.45 In the previous six months, 2,728 security information reports had been submitted. The most common subjects on the closed site were threats to prisoners, drugs and mobile telephones and, on the open site, mobile telephones, drugs and alcohol. Intelligence was analysed thoroughly and key concerns identified, but the objectives set did not always reflect those concerns. Target searching was not always completed within reasonable timescales due to a lack of staff.

I.46 Security, safer custody and residential managers communicated well but this did not spread to staff on the ground and the security department appeared to be working in isolation at times. Key departments were rarely represented at the monthly security meeting and security staff did not often attend other relevant meetings. Information sharing by security with other departments was reasonable. The prison had support from police intelligence officers and adequate anti-corruption procedures.

I.47 The random positive random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate for the six months to June 2014 was 10.9% (with a high spike of 21.7% in April 2014) against a target of 9.7%. The year-to-date figure was 14.9%. The suspicion testing rate was 28.6% in the same period. Some requested suspicion tests and most random tests at weekends were not completed due to staff shortages. MDT results for both sites were aggregated, which made it difficult to isolate drug supply hotspots.

I.48 In our survey, 38% of prisoners on the closed site, against the comparator of 32%, said it was easy to get drugs in the prison and 17%, against 13%, that it was easy to get alcohol. Prisoners also told us that prescription medication and novel psychoactive substances, especially Black Mamba, (not currently detectable by MDT) were widely available. More than twice the comparator, 17% against 8% of prisoners, said they had developed a problem with drugs and 13% against 8% a problem with diverted medication while in the closed prison.

Medication administration was not supervised by discipline officers, creating the potential for prisoners to conceal or pass medication (see also paragraph 2.86 and recommendation 2.92).

- I.49** There was no drug supply reduction strategy and insufficient working links between the security department and the drug strategy committee – there had been no security management attendance at five out of six monthly drug strategy meetings.
- I.50** The MDT suites on both sites were adequately equipped. On the open site, the rooms were clean and tidy, but on the closed site the toilets not clean and there was offensive graffiti in the holding rooms.
- I.51** On the open site, prisoners were not risk tested before or after release on temporary licence (ROTL). In our survey, significantly more prisoners than the comparator at the open site (33% against 22%) said it was easy to get alcohol. The abscond rate was low.

Recommendations

- I.52 Prisoners should only be strip-searched following a risk assessment.**
- I.53 The security team should act on information from security information reports promptly and develop stronger links with other key departments.**
- I.54 Closed visits should be authorised only when there is significant risk justified by security intelligence, and prisoners and visitors should be told about appeal procedures.**
- I.55 There should be a drug and alcohol supply reduction strategy that includes the application of a consistent testing regime, including weekend and risk-based testing.**

Incentives and earned privileges⁴

Expected outcomes:

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

I.56 *The IEP scheme was not well understood by all prisoners or implemented by all staff. Prisoners did not feel the scheme was implemented fairly or encouraged behaviour change. Not all reviews were of sufficient quality. Trends were not effectively monitored.*

- I.57** On the closed site, most prisoners, 68%, were on the standard level of the IEP scheme, 14% on entry level, 15% on enhanced and 3% on basic. On the open site, the majority, 90%, were on enhanced level, 9% on standard, 1% on entry level and none on basic. There was a good system for tracking when prisoners on entry level were due to be reviewed, and most reviews were completed promptly. Prisoners on basic had a reasonable regime, including daily access to showers, association, telephones and work.

⁴ In the previous report, incentives and earned privileges were covered under the healthy prison area of respect. In our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012) they now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

- I.58** In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator on the closed site felt the scheme was implemented fairly, or had encouraged them to change their behaviour. A fifth of prisoners said they did not know what the IEP scheme was. Under the scheme, throwing litter from windows was a trigger for immediate downgrade to basic, which was disproportionate. A recent review of all prisoners on the open site had led to some being downgraded after long periods on enhanced status without clearly reasoned justifications.
- I.59** Staff told us that they often did not have time to record IEP warnings or entries about positive behaviour on prisoner records. Some reviews of prisoners on basic level were cursory and did not set out the actions needed to progress. There was little evidence that IEP information about prisoners' behaviour contributed to sentence planning and management on either site.

Recommendations

- I.60** **Prisoners should be able to contribute to their incentives and earned privileges (IEP) reviews, and be informed in writing of the action they need to take to progress. Decisions to demote prisoners should be fair, clearly justified and based on patterns of behaviour.**
- I.61** **The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme should be linked to the sentence planning process, and should be used to challenge prisoners to achieve agreed targets.** (Repeated recommendation I.57)

Housekeeping point

- I.62** Staff should be consistent in recording entries about positive and negative behaviour in prisoner records.

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.

- I.63** *The number of adjudications was high but they were conducted fairly. Collective punishments were threatened and used on the open site. Use of force had increased. It was proportionate in the cases examined but full restraint was used in a high number of incidents. Planned interventions were not routinely filmed. There had been little analysis of use of force and quality assurance was limited. Use of special accommodation was high, often for too long and poorly documented. Most prisoners were in the segregation unit for short periods but a significant minority had been there for too long. Reintegration planning was poor for some. The segregation regime was inadequate and there was no monitoring or analysis of the use of segregation.*

Disciplinary procedures

- I.64** Most adjudications related to the closed site and the number, at 1,326 in the previous six months, was higher than at our last inspection and very high for the type of prison. The main charges on the closed site were for disobedience, unauthorised articles, and threats and

assaults, and on the open site for unauthorised articles and ROTL matters. A small number of prisoners presenting difficult behaviours had benefited from the SORI (supporting offenders through rehabilitation inside) course (see paragraph 4.49).

- I.65** The adjudications we observed were well conducted in appropriate surroundings, and documentation showed that prisoners were given every chance to give their account of events. Records were generally detailed, punishments were proportionate and the Independent Adjudicator attended monthly to hear the more serious charges.
- I.66** Adjudication meetings had recently been reinstated. There was some monitoring and analysis of statistics but it was too soon to identify any trends. There was no quality assurance of adjudication documentation.
- I.67** On the open site we found a notice displayed to prisoners threatening a collective punishment of loss of ROTL if the fire alarm was set off maliciously, and prisoners and managers told us that this punishment had been used; this was inappropriate.

Recommendations

- I.68** **There should be detailed analyses of all disciplinary procedures, including adjudications, use of force and segregation.**
- I.69** **Collective punishments should not be threatened or used.**

Housekeeping point

- I.70** There should be quality assurance of adjudications.

The use of force

- I.71** The use of force was very rare on the open site. On the closed site, it had increased since our last inspection, although it was average for the type of prison. The use of full restraint had reduced, but it still accounted for 60% of all incidents. Documentation was generally well completed, although some officer statements lacked detail about the behaviour of the prisoner during the incident. The records gave us some assurance that prisoners were restrained as a last resort and de-escalation was often evident. Planned interventions were not routinely filmed, and we found too many incidents identified as planned interventions that had no supporting video evidence. The recordings we viewed were too poor to be used for evidence.
- I.72** Only 20% of incidents had some form of quality assurance at the recently reinstated use of force meetings. There had been little analysis, monitoring and discussion of statistics (see recommendation I.68). Debriefs of prisoners who had been restrained had recently been introduced. We were concerned to find that prisoner complaints about the use of force recorded in two debriefs had not been followed up (see main recommendation S42 and section on complaints).
- I.73** Use of special accommodation was high, with nine incidents in the previous six months. Use of the accommodation was poorly documented, and in at least two incidents the reasons for placing the prisoner in the cell had not been recorded. We found two incidents where the duty governor had authorised a further period in the cells when the prisoners had clearly calmed down and staff said they were ready to come out of the cell.

Recommendations

- I.74** There should be quality assurance of all use of force incidents as soon as possible after the incident, with fuller discussion at the use of force meetings.
- I.75** The use of special accommodation should be fully documented, including the reasons why a prisoner is located there, and prisoners should be moved as soon as they are compliant.

Segregation

- I.76** The segregation unit on the closed site was also used to hold prisoners segregated from the open site. The communal areas were clean with good natural light, but some cells were grubby and had offensive graffiti. Although there was a painting programme, these cells required immediate attention.
- I.77** In the previous six months, 207 prisoners had been segregated. Seventeen prisoners were segregated during our inspection, including nine for reasons of good order or discipline, five awaiting adjudication, two awaiting accommodation on the vulnerable prisoner unit, and one on a constant watch – the use of the unit for the latter two reasons was inappropriate (see also recommendation I.38). Although records about lengths of stay were incomplete, we were assured that most prisoners returned quickly to normal location in the prison. There was no written policy for segregation, but it was accepted that prisoners would not be transferred out of the prison from the unit. In some cases, this had meant a few prisoners had been held there longer than was appropriate to their circumstances when they could have been better accommodated in other prisons (see main recommendation S43).
- I.78** There was no guidance to support reintegration of segregated prisoners to normal location. A few prisoners remained in the unit for long periods with little recorded in reviews to reflect their current circumstances. One prisoner had been held there for 13 months and a further two for over five months. Only one of these prisoners had any meaningful care planning, and none had any reintegration planning. We found one of these long-stay prisoners living in squalid conditions with no access to activities. The regime was poor for all prisoners, and most told us they spent most of the day locked in their cells. (see main recommendation S43.)
- I.79** Staff-prisoner relationships in the unit were reasonable, staff knew the prisoners well and the interactions we saw were positive. Segregation monitoring and review group meetings had been reinstated but there had been little analysis and monitoring of segregation (see recommendation I.68).

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.80 *Although the prison's overall strategy on substance misuse lacked direction, most prisoners appreciated the support they received. Most prisoners on opiate substitution were on maintenance doses, but many had no clinical reviews. Prisoners on the closed site had insufficient access to group work and peer supporters. Prisoners on the open site had better access to peer supporters but support meetings were not available, and there were no evening or weekend access to services for those who worked outside.*

I.81 The integrated substance misuse service (ISMS) was delivered by the Worcester Health and Care Trust across both sites. A drug strategy committee met monthly, with sporadic attendance from key departmental managers. Meetings lacked a forward-looking strategic emphasis, action points had been carried over from previous meetings many times, and there was no strategic action plan.

I.82 On the closed site, 211 prisoners were receiving opiate substitution treatment. A shortage of clinical nursing staff and GP sessions meant that most clinical reviews, required by national guidelines, did not take place. There were 99 prisoners on the waiting list for clinical reviews, and some prisoners told us they had not had a review for six months. Given the lack of an appropriate review process, and an average stay of only six weeks, it was safer that up to 70% of prisoners receiving opiate substitution were on maintenance doses (which avoided the risk of their use of other drugs on top of their methadone). However, more should have been done to support prisoners into reduction and recovery.

I.83 On the closed site, prisoners were positive about the care they received from the ISMS, and in our survey, 85% of prisoners, against the comparator of 75%, said the support they had received for their drug or alcohol problems had been helpful. However, because of staff shortages the 'building skills for recovery' (BSR) course had been suspended for July 2014. There were eight ISMS peer supporters, but they were often not unlocked by discipline staff to help other prisoners in crisis – especially in the evenings. Weekly Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) fellowship meetings were available, run by visiting external facilitators.

I.84 On the open site, ISMS provided a good one-to-one service based on individual needs, but there were no group work programmes or AA meetings. Prisoners who worked off-site had less access to ISMS workers as they were not available in the evenings or at weekends, but they had good access to four peer supporters.

Recommendations

I.85 **The integrated substance misuse service (ISMS) should be sufficiently resourced to deliver timely clinical reviews, recovery-focused treatment, and contracted one-to-one and group-work interventions.**

I.86 **A strategic action plan should be developed and reviewed at the monthly drug strategy meeting.**

I.87 Prisoners on the open site should have access to ISMS services in the evening and at weekends, and to a weekly Alcoholics Anonymous meeting.

Housekeeping point

I.88 ISMS peer supporters should be promptly unlocked to attend prisoners whenever they need support.

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 *Living conditions on both sites had improved but were still not satisfactory. Over a third of cells on the closed site were overcrowded. Some showers were in poor condition. Both sites had unnecessary failings in essential services, such as clean bedding and clothing, and cleaning materials, and prisoners' mail was often delayed. Response to cell call bells on the closed site was often slow and this was not monitored. Applications regularly went unanswered.*

2.2 Flooring was in poor condition in many cells and communal areas in the closed site, and many cell walls were damaged or had graffiti, some of which was offensive. More than a third of cells, 38%, held more prisoners than they were designed for. Metal double bunks with sharp edges in small cells were a particular problem on house block 3. There had been recent attention to improving cleanliness, but this was still inadequate on most house blocks, partly because prisoner cleaners were not actively supervised and also did not have the necessary cleaning materials. Prisoners did not have keys to lock their cells when unoccupied, and there was a prevalence of stealing connected to debt and violence (see paragraph 1.22 and main recommendation S42).

2.3 The dormitories in The Grange Resettlement Unit (open site) had seen some improvements, and a painting programme was under way, but the floor coverings were very worn and impossible to keep clean, and the communal areas and dormitories showed much wear and tear. The dormitories were also not improved by a profusion of makeshift curtains and clothes lines that prisoners had improvised to establish personal space. The 10-person dormitories felt particularly crowded. Excellent new showers were opened during the inspection week.

2.4 Prisoners everywhere were dissatisfied with the provision of basic services, such as clothing and bedding, cleaning materials, and the mail service. In our survey, fewer than half of prisoners said that they normally received enough clean, suitable clothes for the week. Many prisoners had to use their own shampoo for cleaning basins and washing up their plates and cutlery. On both sites, prisoners said they had less access to cleaning materials than the comparators. These problems were partly due to the pressures of reduced staffing, but managers had begun to improve the systems to ensure availability of these basic services.

2.5 Prisoner access to showers was good, except on one spur where only one of three sets of showers was in use in the inspection week. However, the condition of the showers, although less dire than at the previous inspection, was not good, and in some cases was very poor.

2.6 Officers were persistently slow to answer emergency cell bells. There were no systems to monitor the timeliness of response. In our survey, only 12% of prisoners on the closed site said that their cell bell was normally answered within five minutes, and we heard many reports of much longer waits. This was not only much poorer than the comparator of 31%, but had also fallen from the response of 23% at the previous inspection.

- 2.7** Prisoners and staff told us that the applications system did not work well. Responses were often late or non-existent, causing much frustration to prisoners. The prison was involving experienced prisoners in signposting their peers to the right people or departments, but this did not address the underlying inadequacies of the system.
- 2.8** In our survey, only 18% of prisoners on the closed site said they could normally get their stored property from reception, which appeared to be related to a lack of staff to escort them. Many formal complaints related to property issues (see section on complaints).
- 2.9** On both sites, more prisoners than the comparator and than at the last inspection said that they had had problems with mail. Many complained to us about delays to both incoming and outgoing mail. Staff confirmed that mail arrived late in the day, which they said was partly due to lack of a regular post room team. In our survey, 54% of prisoners on the closed site said their legal correspondence had been opened when they were not present, and many prisoners we interviewed echoed this concern.

Recommendations

- 2.10 Standards of cleanliness in all areas should be significantly improved and maintained and facilities refurbished to an acceptable standard.** (Repeated recommendation HP48)
- 2.11 Single cells should not be used for double occupancy.** (Repeated recommendation 2.8)
- 2.12 Dormitory accommodation on the open site should be refurbished and offer appropriate levels of privacy and space.** (Repeated recommendation 2.9)
- 2.13 Prisoners should have keys to lock their own cells, or officers should lock cells without delay when prisoners leave the wing.**
- 2.14 Staff should respond to cell call bells within five minutes.**
- 2.15 Every prisoner application should receive a substantive response within a fixed timescale.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.16** The sharp edges of the metal bunks on house block 3 should be made safe.
- 2.17** Legal correspondence should not be opened without prisoners being present or giving their express permission.

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.

2.18 *Prisoners were mostly positive about their relationships with staff, but staff were often too busy to respond to their requests. Prisoner consultation was underdeveloped. Not all prisoners had a personal officer.*

2.19 In our survey, more prisoners than the comparator on the closed site said that most staff treated them with respect, although black and minority ethnic prisoners were less positive than white prisoners. However, only a quarter of prisoners said staff had checked on them personally within the past week, and most reported little contact with staff during association.

2.20 We observed some good engagement by staff, but often they were very busy and overwhelmed with requests. On the closed site, we saw many prisoners waiting for long periods during association to get staff attention. On the open site, prisoners told us that not all cover staff from the closed site adapted their working styles to reflect the population there.

2.21 The personal officer scheme did not work effectively, and significantly fewer prisoners on both sites than at the last inspection and elsewhere said they had a personal officer. There was no personal officer scheme in operation on the open site.

2.22 Few of the prisoner case notes we sampled had any regular staff entries about prisoner conduct or feelings, and there was no evidence of management checks. Most entries were perfunctory, and one used derogatory language about a prisoner.

2.23 Prisoner consultation arrangements were underdeveloped. There was a monthly prisoner consultation meeting on both sites, but it was not widely attended by key prison staff, and many prisoners we spoke to were not aware of how they could attend. Not all house blocks held consultation meetings, and there was no systematic process for prisoners to feed issues into the main meeting.

Recommendations

2.24 **There should be regular checks on each prisoner by a named member of staff who is aware of his individual needs and provides support. A good quality record of contact should be maintained.**

2.25 **Effective prisoner consultation arrangements should be developed on both sites.**

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

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

2.26 *Regular equality meetings and the action plan had not led to tangible progress, and monitoring data were not always collected or discussed systematically. Investigation of the few discrimination complaints was poor and many replies were late. The identification of prisoners with protected characteristics was reasonably good, but there was not enough dedicated staff time to address all prisoners' needs. Not all prisoners with protected characteristics had adequate support, although some groups had a reasonable level of care.*

Strategic management

- 2.27** The overarching equality policy did not describe current local practice or include up-to-date policies for each protected characteristic prisoner group. The deputy governor chaired monthly equality meetings, which produced an action plan, but many issues were not progressed promptly. Equality data collection and monitoring did not cover all protected characteristics and was not always analysed effectively. Equality issues were not regularly considered at senior management team meetings.
- 2.28** One equality adviser and one part-time administrator coordinated all the diversity and equality work, but did not have enough time to complete all the necessary tasks. A member of the senior management team was the lead on each protected characteristic but had little time to allocate to prisoner equality duties. There had been no staff training on equality or diversity issues in the previous six months.
- 2.29** Eleven prisoner equality representatives covered each house block and the open site. They provided some useful support to individual prisoners and attended the equality meeting.
- 2.30** There had been 35 discrimination incident reports (DIRFs) in the previous six months. Over half of replies were outstanding and some were very late, including one reported by a prisoner 10 months previously. The quality of investigation was often poor, and often did not include interviews with the complainant. Some replies were inadequate and did not address the discrimination issue - for example, an investigation of a theft linked to alleged homophobic bullying only covered the missing items. There was no evidence of quality assurance or independent scrutiny of DIRF investigations.

Recommendations

- 2.31** **The prison should extend equality monitoring to include all protected characteristics.** (Repeated recommendation 2.24)

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

- 2.32** **Discrimination incident reporting forms should be investigated within a reasonable timescale and prisoners informed of the outcome in writing. Effective quality assurance procedures should be put in place.** (Repeated recommendation 2.25)

Protected characteristics

- 2.33** Thirty per cent of prisoners on the closed site, and 47% on the open site, were from a black or minority background. In our surveys, they were more negative than white prisoners about a range of important issues, including respectful treatment from staff, victimisation by staff and access to work. There was no specific forum for them, or most other protected groups, to discuss concerns..
- 2.34** Ten prisoners had identified their background to the prison as Gypsy, Traveller or Romany, although our survey suggested much higher numbers. A forum met monthly and provided some support.
- 2.35** Nearly one in 10 prisoners were foreign nationals, with Poles and Vietnamese the largest groups. There were two foreign national prisoners at the open site. There were 12 immigration detainees held beyond the end of their sentence, including one held for two years. There was no dedicated staff post or forum to address their concerns. Prisoner diversity representatives offered good individual support and could provide free overseas letters. Free monthly international telephone calls were given to prisoners not receiving visits, but not all eligible prisoners knew about this. There was little translated material and records showed very little use of professional telephone interpreters. Home Office Immigration Enforcement staff held well-advertised monthly surgeries, and four immigration staff were based at the prison. There was no independent immigration advice service.
- 2.36** Most new arrivals completed a useful questionnaire identifying protected characteristics. Residential staff were emailed about any prisoners who required follow up, and notified to complete a personal emergency evacuation plan (PEEP) as necessary. Most prisoners who needed one had a PEEP, copies were held on house blocks and centrally, and staff knew how to locate them. Twenty-three per cent of prisoners on the open site, and 29% on the closed site had disclosed a disability. Some prisoners with physical disabilities on the closed site had had appropriate adaptations to their cells or were permitted equipment for daily tasks. One blind prisoner had been provided with audio books and a speaking clock, and given in-cell work. Others were less well supported, struggled with routine activities, and relied on informal support from other prisoners. There was no formal paid carer scheme and prisoners did not have care plans. Not all wing staff were aware of how to support prisoners with disabilities to access facilities, and we met some who were isolated and frustrated. In our survey, prisoners with disabilities reported poor access to the library, gym and showers. There were no forums for disabled prisoners or interim checks of their needs. On the open site, 89% of disabled prisoners said they had problems on arrival. Many areas of the open site had limited access for anyone with mobility issues.
- 2.37** Seven men were aged over 70, and 20% of prisoners across both sites were over 50. Some older prisoners on the closed site had access to wing-based recreational activities, including carpet bowls and dominos, and most told us they were unlocked during the day if not attending work or education. Remedial gym sessions were on the timetable but not all prisoners knew of these. Retired prisoners were not charged for their television. There were no support groups for older prisoners.
- 2.38** A new forum to support gay and bisexual prisoners was due to hold its first meeting in the coming month. Fewer than 1% of prisoners had disclosed their sexual orientation as gay or

bisexual to the prison. There was a compact covering support for transgender prisoners, but the two transgender prisoners on the closed site had not been successfully integrated and had struggled to access support promptly.

Recommendations

- 2.39** Minority groups should be systematically identified, supported and consulted, to ensure that their needs are assessed, negative perceptions understood and inequalities of treatment addressed. Dedicated support forums should be in place.
- 2.40** Immigration detainees should not be held in prisons other than in exceptional circumstances following risk assessment.
- 2.41** Foreign nationals should have access to independent immigration advice and to telephone interpreting where necessary, especially for confidential matters.
- 2.42** Prisoners who need one should have a paid carer and a care plan.

Housekeeping point

- 2.43** Foreign national prisoners should be informed that they can have monthly telephone calls and letters in exchange for visits.

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.

2.44 *The chaplaincy was prominent in the prison, and prisoners had good opportunities to attend services. Faith facilities were generally good, although the room for Friday Muslim prayers on the open site was cramped and the multi-faith area on the closed site needed maintenance.*

2.45 Prisoners had good weekly access to corporate worship on both sites, including in-cell provision if they could not attend main services. There was no Catholic chaplain due to delays in security clearance, but a visiting chaplain had held weekly services. In our survey, prisoners on the closed site were more negative than the comparator about their ability to attend religious services and speak to a religious leader in private. There had been no recent consultation with prisoners about faith issues.

2.46 Faith facilities were generally good, with two good-sized chapels. The multi-faith rooms on both sites were used for a range of services. The room on the closed site needed maintenance and was dirty because it was regularly used to distribute shop orders. The open site multi-faith room was too small for the current population to worship together. There were appropriate arrangements for observance of religious festivals. Muslim prisoners taking part in Ramadan told us they were satisfied with the arrangement.

- 2.47** Chaplaincy staff were visible around the prison and provided support to prisoners in crisis. Four were trained as ACCT assessors, but were not always notified of ACCT reviews. The chaplaincy had links with some outside faith communities, and were supported by several volunteers in delivering faith activities.

Recommendation

- 2.48** **The prison should investigate prisoners' views and needs related to faith and religion to inform the provision of faith activities.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.49** The multi-faith areas should be kept clean.
- 2.50** Chaplaincy staff should be notified of and invited to ACCT reviews for prisoners they have supported.

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.

- 2.51** *Some serious allegations of assaults by staff had been investigated poorly or not at all.. Many prisoners had little confidence in the complaints system.*

- 2.52** Complaint forms were readily available to all prisoners. Responses to general complaints were usually polite and appropriate, and quality assurance was evident. However, there were some long delays in responses. In our survey, only 24% of prisoners on the closed site thought that complaints were responded to promptly, and this was echoed in prisoner groups. There was no regular monitoring of the number of outstanding responses or recurrent causes for delays.
- 2.53** Too many prisoners resorted to the complaints system for low-level issues that should have been resolved by wing staff or through applications. Problems with obtaining property and the inefficient shop system were prominent themes.
- 2.54** The confidential access complaints procedure, which ensured that complaints were seen by the governor or deputy governor, was ineffective and poorly managed. There had been no formal responses to a quarter of such complaints in the previous six months, which was unacceptable. Such complaints usually related to staff, and some involved serious sexual or other assault allegations. In one case of alleged sexual assault, we were told that a prison investigation had not taken place because the police were actively investigating it; when we contacted the police, they told us that they were not in fact undertaking any investigation and had informed prison managers that they should investigate it in the first instance. The prisoner in question was particularly distressed at this apparent lack of concern (see main recommendation S42 and section on bullying and violence reduction).

- 2.55** Very few complaints were received from the open site. The differing issues for the open site were not identified through a routine disaggregation of trends data.

Recommendation

- 2.56** All complaints, including confidential access complaints, should be investigated fully and promptly, and monitored by the senior management team.

Housekeeping point

- 2.57** There should be separate analyses of complaints and any trends for the closed and open sites.

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.

- 2.58** *Legal rights information and support for prisoners were inadequate. Legal visits arrangements were reasonable and included video conferencing facilities.*

- 2.59** Although there was a duty legal services officer for both sites, too many prisoners did not know about who to turn to for legal rights information. In our survey, only 13% of prisoners on the closed site said they found it easy to get bail information, against the comparator of 20%. The duty officers were not trained.

- 2.60** Legal visitors told us that they had long waits to be escorted to the visits area and found it difficult to change bookings. Legal visits facilities were generally reasonable and there was regular use of the video-link service. The prisoners' waiting area was cramped and the toilets had little privacy.

Recommendations

- 2.61** Legal services officers should be sufficiently trained, and information about legal services should be prominently displayed.
- 2.62** Legal visits should start on time, and prisoners should have adequate waiting facilities.

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.

2.63 *There was a range of clinics and health screening facilities but staff shortages had affected health services. Prisoner access to and attendance at appointments was not good, especially to see a GP. The inpatient unit needed further refurbishment, and was used inappropriately to accommodate prisoners with no health care need. Prisoners had limited access to a pharmacist, and medicine administration was not sufficiently supervised. Dental care was satisfactory but access on the open site was poor. Prisoners received adequate mental health care.*

Governance arrangements

- 2.64** The prison had good arrangements with the health care providers and the governor was actively involved with the partnership board. Local meetings supplied information to the board and the providers had a regular presence in the prison, monitoring and supporting the development of services. Prisoners in our survey were generally negative about the health services, largely focusing on difficulties in accessing clinics.
- 2.65** Clinical care was provided in a large health care centre on the closed site, with a small facility for consultation and medicine administration on the open site. Treatment and medicine administration were also carried out on each wing. The clinical rooms were in varied stages of refurbishment; some had excellent new facilities and others were waiting for further work to comply with infection control standards.
- 2.66** There had been a health needs assessment in 2013 with a further assessment due for 2014. The health care department was well managed but staffing remained a problem and had a detrimental effect on delivery of services (see recommendation 2.81). There were four nurse vacancies and a reliance on GP locums, and seven staff were on sick leave.
- 2.67** The health care team were well qualified to deliver a range of services, with visiting specialists available as required. Commissioners had advised strengthening leadership arrangements for the three GPs and had provided additional supervision from a clinical director. There was a clear structure for the management and leadership of primary care nursing. Prisoners had access to a nurse practitioner and there were four nurse prescribers. Care was provided over 24 hours and there were three health care staff in the prison at night. All staff had received an appraisal in the previous year, and these led to training plans for them. Training opportunities were available through the provider but there were some delays in meeting the annual mandatory elements. Other training had been delivered in response to concerns and risks. Clinical supervision was available and was well documented. Health care staff were kept informed about treatment guidelines through regular staff meetings and notices.
- 2.68** Clinical records were maintained electronically using SystmOne (the electronic clinical IT system), and those we sampled were well written.

- 2.69** There was a health care forum for prisoners to voice any concerns. Information about the health care complaints process was displayed around the prison. Complainants received a prompt and good quality response from the most appropriate member of staff.
- 2.70** An up-to-date health promotion strategy informed the delivery of screening services and information. National theme days were followed, and there was an annual programme of health promotion events for prisoners. However, meetings of the health promotion action group had lapsed.
- 2.71** Emergency resuscitation equipment, including automated external defibrillators (AED) and oxygen, was located on all wings, reception, the health care centre and on the open site. The equipment was well maintained, but discipline staff did not have access to the AEDs and were not trained in their use.

Recommendation

- 2.72 All health care staff should complete annual mandatory training, and custody staff should be trained in the use of defibrillators.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.73** All clinical rooms should comply with the control of infection criteria.
- 2.74** The health promotion action group should meet regularly.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.75** New arrivals were assessed for their physical and mental health needs and any substance misuse issues. These assessments were recorded consistently and reviewed within 48 hours, when prisoners received a secondary, more comprehensive assessment. Prescribing and care planning information about the prisoner's previous medical history was requested from his GP to further inform the assessments.
- 2.76** All prisoners were offered further appropriate health screening and immunisations. Clear and accessible patient information about common conditions and injuries was available. There were prompt referrals to primary health care professionals for more in-depth assessment, where specific health needs were identified. Nurses were aware of any prisoners with complex health needs. There were some audits to monitor clinical outcomes for prisoners with long-term conditions, including audits of records, diabetes management and immunisations.
- 2.77** Three part-time GPs provided most clinics, with additional locum GPs as required. Cover was not always available and led to delays in the availability of clinics and affected non-urgent appointments. Prisoners told us that they had been waiting up to eight weeks to see a GP. The out-of-hours service was provided by the same service as for the local community. Segregated prisoners were seen each day by health care staff.
- 2.78** The recent withdrawal of prison staff in some areas had contributed to pressures on health care delivery and meant that prisoners did not always receive the care and treatment they required. There was a high level of non-attendance at internal and external health appointments, which was partially due to lack of prison staff.

- 2.79** The inpatient unit was in the health care centre and could accommodate up to 18 patients; some of the cells needed refurbishment. The regime was more restricted when discipline staff were not available and did not provide a sufficiently therapeutic environment. We were told that the unit was usually full but not all inpatients had been admitted for health care needs, and some were held there when it would have been more appropriate to integrate them into normal accommodation.
- 2.80** External health care appointments were continually reprioritised by nursing staff according to medical need because of the lack of prison escort staff, and referrals were higher than we normally see. This was monitored and reported to commissioners and the prison. Records showed that up to 20% of external health care appointments were cancelled and rebooked almost daily.

Recommendations

- 2.81 Prisoners' access to health services should be significantly improved: they should not have to wait more than two weeks for routine GP appointments, and there should be sufficient officers to ensure that they can attend booked health care appointments inside the prison and at outside hospitals.**
- 2.82 Prisoners should only be admitted to the inpatient unit for their health care needs.**
- 2.83 The inpatient unit should provide a regime that supports a therapeutic environment, and cells should be clean, well decorated and maintained.**

Pharmacy

- 2.84** Pharmacy services were provided by Lloyds pharmacy, and a pharmacist was on site three days a week. However, prisoners had little access to the pharmacist. There were no pharmacy-led clinics and no medicine use reviews.
- 2.85** Medicines were mainly prescribed and administered on SystmOne. There was an up-to-date in-possession policy. Patients were risk assessed when medication was started or changed, and they signed the chart on collection. Prisoners who had their medicines in possession had no secure storage in their cells.
- 2.86** Medicines were administered mainly by nursing staff for those going to court and from treatment rooms on the house blocks and the open site. There were often no discipline staff supervising administration on the closed site and so the nurse had to control the behaviour of patients; this was a distraction while administering medicines and limited patient confidentiality (see also security section). The final administration times on Friday and the weekend were at around 3.15pm, which meant that medicines for night sedation were administered at an inappropriate time. Some prisoners complained that they had not received their medication at all. There was no robust procedure to follow up patients who had missed their medication.
- 2.87** The pharmacy technician visited the treatment rooms weekly to check stock, and this was well managed. The technician checked on SystmOne which patients were receiving medicines from the treatment room and provided stock accordingly.
- 2.88** A reasonable range of medicines was available through 'special sick' (outside normal surgery hours). There were a limited number of patient group directions, authorising health care

professionals to supply and administer prescription-only medicine. The supply of controlled drugs was generally well managed. On house block 4, methadone was recorded on an electronic register, but neither the prescription and administration chart nor the electronic register had space to record the witness. The new registers in the pharmacy room did not comply with current regulations.

- 2.89** There was a range of policies and procedures on medicines management and the pharmacy service. The pharmacist undertook clinical audits of all prescribed medicines and regular audits of procedures. The medicines and therapeutics committee met regularly with appropriate representation. Although there had been a recent review, the prescribing of medicines subject to abuse was on an upward trend.

Recommendations

- 2.90 Pharmacy-led clinics and medicine use reviews should be introduced.** (Repeated 2.81)
- 2.91 Secure lockable medicines storage facilities should be provided for all prisoners who receive their medication in possession.** (Repeated recommendation 2.80)
- 2.92 Medicine administration should take place at clinically appropriate times and be appropriately supervised by prison officers.**
- 2.93 The reason a patient does not receive medication should be recorded, and there should be a robust process for following up patients.**
- 2.94 The use of patient group directions should be expanded to allow the supply of a wider range of medicines by registered nurses.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.95** Registers and signing procedures should comply with current pharmacy regulations.

Dentistry

- 2.96** Dental services were included in the main provider contract. Three dentists visited the prison regularly and there were seven dental sessions a week. There were 145 prisoners on the triage waiting list, with the longest average waits up to eight weeks. Routine appointments were scheduled within two to three weeks and there was no waiting list. Prisoners with urgent or emergency needs were usually seen within 24 hours on weekdays. Prisoners had to be escorted to all appointments, which caused delays. The did-not-attend rate was approximately 30% (see recommendation 2.81).
- 2.97** Prisoners at the open site were taken out to a dental practice in the community by minibus. However, there had been some problems with this service and cancellations of sessions by the dentist, resulting in waiting times of up to three months.
- 2.98** The consultations we observed were respectful and thorough, and included immediate necessary treatment, such as simple extraction, during triage. Dental records were maintained on SystemOne. Formal interpreting services were not used for non-English speakers and there was no telephone line to facilitate this. A dental educator held a

fortnightly session in the surgery covering issues such as oral hygiene and plaque removal, and attendance was good.

- 2.99** The surgery was visibly clean and tidy. We were told that a recent infection control audit had been good. There was oxygen in the surgery and reliance on the main resuscitation kit from health care. Arrangements to service and maintain the dental equipment were shared between the prison and health care.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.100** An integrated mental health team provided primary and secondary mental health care, but the nurses were also used to administer medications for prisoners and none carried an individual caseload to ensure continuity of care. The care programme approach was not used for the management of patients with enduring mental health needs, and there was no access to learning disability specialists.
- 2.101** The total caseload included 114 prisoners who required an initial mental health assessment and 107 prisoners receiving ongoing treatment. The team operated in a multidisciplinary manner with weekly meetings, including safer custody staff, to discuss all cases. Only the mental health team attended the meeting during our inspection. A new referral meeting was also held weekly before patients were allocated.
- 2.102** Patients had good access to three psychiatrists who provided four sessions a week. There were approximately 25 transfers to secure mental health units each year, and the waiting times were reasonable.
- 2.103** Prisoners had no access to professional counselling services. There was no regular programme of mental health awareness training for discipline staff.

Recommendations

- 2.104** **Patients receiving secondary mental health care should be seen by a named nurse to ensure the continuity of their care.**
- 2.105** **The care programme approach should be used for the management of patients with enduring mental health problems.**
- 2.106** **Prisoners should have access to professional counselling services. (Repeated recommendation 2.91)**
- 2.107** **Mental health awareness training should be delivered to all prison staff. (Repeated recommendation 2.92)**

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.

2.108 *The food appeared reasonable, but many prisoners on the closed site were unhappy with the quality and quantity. Prisoner consultation had not led to meaningful improvement. Prisoners could eat their meals communally but there was space for only a minority on both sites to do so.*

2.109 In our survey, only 13% of prisoners on the closed site said that the food was good. Many commented that it was bland and repetitive, and portions were too small. The food that we tried was reasonable. There was a variety of healthy options, including vegetables and fruit on most, but not all, days. We found out-of-date milk provided on one day. Most meals were cooked from fresh ingredients and menus generally met the needs of different diets and cultural needs. Breakfast packs were issued the day before they were to be eaten at the closed site, and the portions of cereals were meagre.

2.110 In theory, prisoners could eat communally on dining tables on each wing, but space was severely limited. The dining room on the open site was too small to accommodate all prisoners, and only about a quarter could eat there at the same time. The majority of prisoners on the open site had no opportunity to self-cater.

2.111 There were separate catering arrangements for the closed and open sites, and both kitchens were clean and well maintained. Thirty-five prisoners were employed in the kitchen and serveries on both sites, and they could obtain accredited catering qualifications.

2.112 There were reasonable attempts at consultation on both sites. There were biannual food surveys, prisoner forums and regularly checked food comments books, but they had so far had little impact on the overwhelmingly negative perception of the food.

Recommendations

2.113 **On the closed site, breakfast packs should be more substantial and served on the day they are to be eaten, food and drink should be in date, and fresh fruit should be offered every day.**

2.114 **All prisoners should be able to eat communally, and more of those on the open site should be able to cook for themselves.**

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

2.115 *There were long delays for delivery of prisoners' shop orders, especially for new arrivals. This created frustration, debt and bullying. Items regularly went missing and prisoners had no trust in the system.*

2.116 The prison shop system was inefficient and widely criticised by prisoners and staff. Prisoners could wait for up to 17 days to receive their first order, and this often led to debt and bullying (see paragraph 1.22 and main recommendation S42). Smokers' and non-smokers' packs were available from reception but were inadequate to cover the delays in delivery.

2.117 Missing items from shop orders was one of the top complaints received in the previous six months, and managers acknowledged that this was a legitimate concern; items often went missing at the packing stage, which was handled by a different prison. Refunds were made, although prisoners told us that they were not prompt enough.

Recommendations

2.118 Prisoners should be able to buy items from the prison shop within 24 hours of arrival, and receive their shop orders within seven days thereafter.

2.119 The prison should ensure that goods in prisoners' shop orders are not removed at any stage of the packing, delivery and distribution process.

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 *Over half of prisoners were locked in the cells during the working day, and there were routine additional lock-up periods at weekends. Half an hour was the maximum exercise time on most days, and not all received that much.*

3.2 In principle, a prisoner who worked full time could have up to 10 hours out of his cell on a weekday, and those in part-time work or education could have up to 7.5 hours. The times for locking and unlocking were adhered to. Nevertheless, on two roll checks during the peak working period on two days, we found an average of 54% of prisoners locked in their cells, much too high a proportion – while about a third were involved in some off-wing activity (see main recommendation S44). Retired prisoners were unlocked during the day.

3.3 Because of staff shortages, each house block was locked down for the morning or afternoon every Saturday or Sunday. Time out on the exercise yards, which were just bare concrete, was limited to 30 minutes a day; those in full-time work had no exercise time, other than their walk to and from their work on working days.

Recommendation

3.4 All prisoners should be given an hour's exercise outside each day. (Repeated recommendation 3.4)

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.

3.5 *Management of learning and skills and work required improvement. Self-assessment lacked evaluation and there was poor use of data to inform change. There were sufficient activity places for all prisoners on the open site but not enough on the closed site. Not all the available places were fully used, on both sites. Prisoners on wing work were not kept fully occupied. The range of accredited vocational training was adequate, although there were few progression opportunities for the more able or longer-term prisoners. Success rates in vocational training and education courses were mostly high. The quality of learners' work was good in many areas. The quality of teaching and learning was inconsistent and required improvement, although most vocational training was good. Peer mentoring support for learners was satisfactory. Attendance and punctuality in most classes were poor across the sites. Prisoners had good access to the library, and access for vulnerable prisoners had recently improved.*

3.6 *Ofsted⁷ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision on both sites:*

Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work: Requires improvement

Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work: Requires improvement

Quality of learning and skills and work provision: Requires improvement

Leadership and management of learning and skills and work: Requires improvement

Management of learning and skills and work

3.7 Progress in the management of learning and skills and work had been hampered by management changes and lack of clear strategic direction. Managers had recently developed a clear strategic plan for learning and skills and were working to address key issues, particularly making better use of the activity places on the closed site. The education and vocational training provided by Milton Keynes College required improvement. The college had failed to maintain the consistently good standards of teaching, learning and assessment found at the last inspection.

3.8 Communication between the Offenders' Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) contractor Milton Keynes College, the National Careers Service (NCS), Jobcentre Plus, other agencies and the prison was satisfactory, and the prison had good links with a range of employers and local colleges that were used particularly well at the open site to improve employment and education opportunities for prisoners. However, the prison was not effective in using information provided at induction about prisoners' initial assessment of English and

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>.

mathematics, prior learning, work experiences and career aims. As a consequence, prisoners were not always allocated to the work or education that best suited their needs. For example, too many learners placed on level 1 courses were found to have already completed several such courses.

- 3.9** Staff supervision of prisoner movement to activities was weak and, along with the high proportion of prisoners who were locked up during the core day (see paragraph 3.2), this affected punctuality and attendance (see main recommendation S44 and recommendation 3.25).
- 3.10** Promotion of safeguarding of learners, and equality and diversity were reasonable, and staff had been appropriately trained. There was mutual respect between tutors, instructors and learners.
- 3.11** The monitoring of teaching, learning and assessment was underdeveloped, and observations were not carried out across all the provision. Observations of the education provision were poorly recorded, and suggested insufficient focus on the quality of learning and assessment. The quality improvement group had been poorly attended and gave insufficient attention to teaching, learning and assessment. There was not enough sharing of best practice. Although the college kept robust data and had accurately identified key areas for improvement, the data gathered by the prison were often unreliable, and insufficiently analysed or used to inform management decisions. Self-assessment of learning and skills across the prison was weak. The self-assessment report was overly descriptive and lacked judgement.

Recommendations

- 3.12** **The prison should ensure that all information gained about prisoners at induction is used effectively to place them in appropriate activities that best suit their needs.**
- 3.13** **Observations of teaching, learning and assessment by the OLASS provider should be better recorded and extended to include all areas of learning and skills, and used to share best practice.**
- 3.14** **Learning and skills data collection and analysis should be improved to inform decision-making and target-setting, and the prison's learning and skills self-assessment should be of sufficient quality to aid quality improvement.**

Provision of activities

- 3.15** The allocation of prisoners to activities was generally efficient, although not informed by the individual action plans produced by the NCS. About 20% of activities were part-time, although we were not given consistent data on this. There were not enough activity places for the population on the closed site, but enough for all prisoners on the open site. Not all the available places were fully used on both sites. Too many prisoners, over 280, were unemployed, although some were on remand and not required to work. Wing workers on both sites were under-occupied during the core day. The range of work activities for vulnerable prisoners remained poor, with access only to wing work and one workshop. Vulnerable prisoner access to education had improved and was satisfactory, and they were now also offered a limited range of vocational courses.

- 3.16** The range of accredited vocational training was adequate, although there were insufficient progression opportunities, particularly for the more able or longer-term prisoners. Vocational courses offered on the closed site included basic construction skills, catering, laundry, warehousing, waste management and recycling, and performing manufacturing operations. Most courses were offered up to level 2 but nothing was available at level 3. The open site offered motorbike engineering and a variety of agricultural and horticultural courses. Courses in industrial cleaning and physical education were offered on both sites. Although some courses, such as radio work, had been stopped due to lack of staff or funding, motorbike engineering had been added, and a course in bee keeping had recently started on the open site. Only around 40 prisoners were currently participating on vocational courses.
- 3.17** There was a reasonable variety of education courses at appropriate levels, with qualifications available in subjects such as art, customer service, English for speakers of other languages (ESOL), and English and mathematics. Approximately 268 prisoners were enrolled on education courses across both sites, although most were part-time. Learners on Open University and distance learning courses received appropriate study support, although only seven prisoners were on such courses and more needed to be done to promote higher level learning to prisoners. A good proportion of prisoners on the open site went out to courses at local colleges or community and paid work. Prisoner pay rates were matched appropriately to job roles and education or training.

Recommendation

- 3.18** **There should be a wider range of education courses and employment opportunities for the more able and longer-term prisoners, more work opportunities for vulnerable prisoners, and better promotion of Open University and distance learning courses.**

Quality of provision

- 3.19** Teaching staff were appropriately qualified and resources generally adequate, although there was insufficient use of information technology in education classes to stimulate and motivate learners fully. The quality of teaching and learning on both sites was inconsistent, although there was some good coaching in vocational training. In the better sessions, teachers and instructors used a wide variety of teaching methods to suit learners' differing needs and abilities. Teachers provided verbal and written feedback on learners' work that was positive, encouraging and helped them know how to make further improvements. Most teachers paid good attention to improving learners' spelling and grammar.
- 3.20** Additional learning support in English and mathematics for learners on education courses was satisfactory, as was the recent integration of English and maths in vocational training areas. Not all prisoner mentors were deployed effectively.

Recommendation

- 3.21** **The quality of teaching should be improved to ensure that all learners experience consistently good teaching, learning and assessment.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.22** In 2012/13, success rates had been high on many qualifications at over 80%, and this was maintained in the 2014/15 year. However, success rates varied across the qualifications. They were very good on the award in employability skills, but required improvement on courses in painting and decorating. Success rates on level 1 English, mathematics level 2, and some ESOL courses also required improvement. Prisoner attendance and punctuality at lessons, training and work was poor, and we observed exceptionally low attendance in some sessions (see main recommendation S44).
- 3.23** The standard of work in education was at least satisfactory, and in some cases good. For example, many ESOL learners made good progress in learning new vocabulary and became confident in developing their language skills. Most learners presented their written work clearly and to a standard that would be expected in employment. Learners had few opportunities to develop their skills in presenting ideas in discussions or presentations. Learners in vocational training areas such as waste management and recycling, and painting and decorating, demonstrated good practical skills.

Recommendations

- 3.24** **There should be better monitoring of the quality of provision to improve pass rates in qualifications that have low achievements.**
- 3.25** **All prisoners allocated to activities should arrive on time.**

Library

- 3.26** Worcestershire County Council managed the libraries at both sites effectively. Prisoner access to the libraries on both sites was good, although there were no clear data on the proportion of prisoners who regularly went to the libraries. Access for vulnerable prisoners had improved recently and was adequate, with plans to improve this further. Prisoners on the open site could also go to the library in the evenings and at weekends. There was a small supply of books on each house block of the closed site, which were frequently updated. Prisoners on the segregation unit were provided with a selection of books.
- 3.27** New arrivals had a timely induction to the library. Displays were used effectively to raise awareness of topical events, such as the recent centenary of the First World War, diversity matters and environmental themes. Librarians liaised well with teachers in education to ensure that resources were continually updated to meet changes to the curriculum.
- 3.28** Stock was adequate on the closed site and met the needs of most prisoners, and the variety of stock was very good on the open site. Prisoners had access to resources on request, as well as legal texts and Prison Service Instructions. There was an adequate range of foreign language books and newspapers on both sites. Reading skills were promoted well through the Storybook Dads initiative (enabling prisoners to record bedtime stories for their children) and the Shannon Trust 'Toe by Toe' reading mentoring scheme at the closed site, although the latter was less successful on the open site. Prisoners' participation in the national six-book challenge (where prisoners can choose six reads, review them, and enter prize draws) was good on both sites.

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.

3.29 *Physical education (PE) staff provided a variety of recreational PE across both sites. The provision was well managed and the facilities on both sites were generally good. There was adequate provision for older and vulnerable prisoners. Promotion of healthy living was appropriate and there was good provision for health care referrals. PE vocational training was reasonable with high qualification pass rates, although the number of courses was limited.*

3.30 PE was well managed and appropriately promoted. Access to recreational PE for prisoners on both sites was adequate, and a reasonable proportion used the provision regularly. Facilities on both sites were generally good. The recent addition of outside fitness equipment had been popular. Facilities on the open site included outdoor pitches, a dedicated classroom and a large, although slightly shabby, cardiovascular suite with a separate weights room. The facilities provided a good range of provision for recreational, remedial PE, and vocational training. Equipment was well-maintained and changing rooms and showers were adequate. PE classrooms were well equipped. A small range of PE equipment was available for vulnerable prisoners on house block 5 and was well used.

3.31 Staff were highly qualified and experienced, and able to deliver an appropriate range of recreational PE and vocational qualifications. Programmes included a level 1 introductory PE courses and a level 2 course, providing learners with good personal, social and employability skills. There were seven learners on a PE programme on the open site. Achievement on courses was high and the majority who started successfully completed them.

3.32 New arrivals received an appropriate induction to PE. There was a reasonable range of recreational PE each week across the sites, including sessions for older prisoners. Provision for vulnerable prisoners had improved and was adequate. Recreational sessions for all prisoners were sometimes cancelled when PE staff were cross-deployed to wing duties.

3.33 Healthy living and the importance of exercise were suitably promoted. One member of staff, who was an experienced body builder with national awards, gave talks to prisoners reinforcing the dangers of using steroids and other drugs to enhance performance. Appropriately trained prisoner orderlies provided additional health and well-being support on the closed site. PE staff gave good remedial support for prisoners referred from health care, and also provided support for prisoners on the inpatient unit, which had some equipment.

Recommendation

3.34 Recreational sessions should not be cancelled.

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** *There was a generally well-informed strategy for reducing reoffending which involved community providers. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was an integral part of the resettlement strategy with a good range of opportunities on the open site. Risk assessment for ROTL had improved significantly but there was still more to do.*
- 4.2** An informative strategy for reducing reoffending covered resettlement but there was no corresponding strategy for offender management. The strategy included information about the prison's population, including offence types, offending-related needs and home areas.
- 4.3** There had been a good range of initiatives to link with services and employers that could support prisoners on release, including a series of community fairs in the prison where prisoners could meet representatives of agencies and employers. There was also an effective working relationship with Worcestershire Integrated Offender Management team to ensure support for prisoners most likely to reoffend who were discharged to that area.
- 4.4** The strategy had appropriate development objectives, allocated to specific managers and monitored by the head of function. Development of resettlement was overseen by a quarterly meeting, which included external providers.
- 4.5** ROTL was an important part of the resettlement strategy on the open site, with 118 prisoners granted temporary release in the previous six months. Prisoners were considered for ROTL directly after their three-month assessment period, and were involved in a range of community work, paid work and college placements. The quality of the assessment of a prisoner's suitability for ROTL had improved in response to increasing public concern but there was still more to do. Staff and prisoners were clear that ROTL was not an automatic entitlement but subject to risk assessment, and had to have a purpose related to their resettlement. The period of assessment had increased and was informed by a range of information from community offender managers, prison probation officers and psychology reports. Applications for ROTL were clear about location, purpose and timings, but some applications for family contact did not contain sufficient detail. A multidisciplinary board considered ROTL applications; the session we observed was rigorous and provided good scrutiny.
- 4.6** The prison failed to review prisoners' offender assessment system (OASys) assessments when they arrived at the open site. This was a serious omission and missed the opportunity to link ROTL activities to a sentence plan based on likelihood of reoffending and risk of harm. It was also not clear whether there was a systematic process to inform the agencies involved in multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) of intended temporary releases to consider their concerns (see main recommendation S45).

- 4.7 The prison was planning for its role as a resettlement prison and a strategy was being discussed with potential partners.

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

4.8 *Offender management was poorly organised and under-resourced on both sites, with backlogs of work and inadequate contact with or direction of prisoners. Home detention curfew and categorisation arrangements were reasonable, but too many prisoners were moved for reasons not related to their progression. Public protection procedures adequately identified high risk prisoners, but communication with MAPPA and action planning were weak. There was no dedicated provision for indeterminate sentence prisoners, although those on the open site had access to some good progression opportunities.*

- 4.9 The quality of offender management on both sites had declined significantly since the last inspection. In our survey, only 24% of sentenced prisoners on the closed site and 52% on the open site said that they had an offender supervisor, which were significantly worse than the comparators. Only 27% of sentenced prisoners on the closed site said that they had a sentence plan, against the comparator of 37%.
- 4.10 Offender management units (OMUs) on both sites were poorly organised. Allocation of cases was not transparent or reliable, and we found that offender supervisors on the open site relied on prisoner resettlement peer workers telling them that a new case required allocation.
- 4.11 Offender supervisors on both sites were regularly redeployed to residential duties without adequate warning, which was a problem in planning their work and contact with prisoners. Prisoners on both sites complained about access to offender supervisors, and on the closed site they rarely saw them. Prisoners on the open site had access to the OMU office at restricted times, but regularly called in at other times. This interrupted the work of the office, and created friction between staff who felt they could not get on with their job and prisoners who felt they were being ignored.
- 4.12 Achievement of sentence plan objectives was too often driven by prisoners who applied for interventions and jobs that they chose, rather than directions based on assessment and planning from an offender supervisor.
- 4.13 There was no formal minimum frequency of contact between offender supervisors and their prisoners, and no evidence of managers checking whether such contacts had been made. Managers were generally unfocused on the progress of work. There was an OASys backlog of 114 out of 720 cases but no strategy to reduce it. Quality assurance was inadequate; too few cases were scrutinised, and obvious deficiencies had not been identified or addressed by managers. On the open site, OASys and sentence plans were not reviewed on arrival, which was a serious omission (see paragraph 4.6 and main recommendation S45).
- 4.14 The quality of the OASys assessments we examined varied, and those prepared by external offender managers were better than those by prison offender supervisors. Although there

were reasonable assessments of the likelihood of reoffending, linked to sentence plan objectives, more than half of the cases we examined did not have an adequate risk management plan.

- 4.15** Home detention curfew (HDC) arrangements on both sites were robust. Decisions were clearly set out and reasonable, and took a balanced view of the likelihood of reoffending, but were undermined by lack of OASys data (see also main recommendation S45). Most releases were within or close to the eligibility date, and those falling outside were for good reasons, such as length of remand periods, changes of application or following a review from an earlier refusal.

Recommendations

- 4.16** **Offender supervisors should have time to manage prisoners' sentences appropriately, and oversee achievement of sentence plan and resettlement targets.**
- 4.17** **All eligible prisoners should have a sentence plan and OASys assessments should be completed on time.** (Repeated recommendation 4.13)
- 4.18** **All relevant prisoners should have a good quality risk management plan that addresses the risk they pose in prison and on release.**

Public protection

- 4.19** A dedicated public protection business administrator identified new arrivals requiring restrictions. She had access to core files, previous convictions and the P-Nomis Prison Service IT system, but did not use the violent and sexual offenders register (VISOR). Restrictions on contact with the public through mail, telephone and visits for prisoners identified as presenting a risk to the public were proportionate and reviewed at the appropriate time.
- 4.20** A monthly interdepartmental risk management team (IRMT) meeting was chaired by the senior probation officer. It reviewed the management of prisoners who were due for release and at the higher MAPPA risk levels. MAPPA levels were checked early in the sentence. Of the 720 MAPPA nominals (individuals targeted for legitimate security reasons), 171 had a risk level assigned and all but 51 were at the lowest risk level. However, the prison did not systematically check MAPPA levels again close to release. This could have resulted in prisoners being assessed and released without the prison being fully aware of their risk management requirements in the community (see main recommendation S45).
- 4.21** Although there were examples of positive contributions to community MAPPA processes, an observed IRMT meeting was not sufficiently robust in identifying all the risk factors relevant to release plans. We were not assured that actions agreed at previous meetings had been implemented.

Recommendation

- 4.22** **Interdepartmental risk management team meetings should identify all the risk factors relevant to release plans, and actions agreed at previous meetings should be consistently implemented.**

Categorisation

4.23 Categorisation reviews took place on time and involved the prisoner. The reasons for categorisation decisions were clearly outlined so that prisoners who had been refused progression could understand what they needed to do to achieve it. Prisoner moves were based on a range of factors. There was evidence that some prisoners were transferred to achieve sentence plan objectives; however, overcrowding moves were too common and meant prisoners were transferred without a reason related to progression in their sentence. The prison was making good progress in bringing its population into line with that of a resettlement prison, so that the majority of the population would have less than 12 months remaining on their sentence and have local links.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

4.24 There was no special provision for indeterminate sentence prisoners on either site, but those in open conditions appreciated the opportunities to progress through work in the community. On the closed site, prisoners newly sentenced to life imprisonment were contacted promptly and moved on at the appropriate time after assessment. Oversight and monitoring of the parole system was disjointed and there was no central process for ensuring that dossiers were submitted to the Parole Board on time.

Housekeeping point

4.25 The submission of parole dossiers should be monitored to ensure that they are within time.

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.

4.26 *Prisoner resettlement workers met all new arrivals and referred them to resettlement services, but there was no case management of resettlement needs. Any outstanding needs were checked before discharge, and discharge arrangements were good. Trained housing advisers worked directly with prisoners, and addressed a wide range of complex housing problems. Arrangements for resettlement into education, training and work were good, and health care discharge and support for substance misusers were good. Not all prisoners were aware of the support available for financial needs. There was a range of innovative family work on both sites, but no family days on the open site, and security checks had affected participation at parenting courses. There were a few offending behaviour courses but a lack of effective offender management support. Two of the courses were good preparation for the prison's coming resettlement focus.*

4.27 Prisoner resettlement workers had been appointed shortly before the inspection to collect information about prisoners' resettlement needs. They saw all new arrivals and prisoners could apply directly to see them for resettlement help thereafter. The system was proving effective, ensuring that prisoners had good access to services, but there were issues of confidentiality that needed to be addressed (see paragraph 1.8).

- 4.28** A dedicated resettlement centre provided a full range of services. Short-term prisoners did not have a custody plan that could be monitored by a staff member to ensure that their needs were met, but all prisoners due for discharge were called to the resettlement centre four weeks beforehand to check their needs.
- 4.29** Prisoners being released were fully informed of their licence requirements and there were efficient travel arrangements for them. Discharge clothing was available for those who required it.

Housekeeping point

- 4.30** Prisoner resettlement workers should not have access to confidential personal information on other prisoners.

Accommodation

- 4.31** Four trained Nacro housing officers based in the prison had developed positive links with prisoners and staff, external accommodation agencies and community resettlement services. An average of 93.5% of prisoners across both sites left to settled accommodation. The housing team was well represented at regular internal multi-agency prison meetings, enabling integration into the wider prison resettlement team. There was good governance of the area, with regular collection of statistics and quarterly reports presented to the senior manager lead. Nacro invited prisoner feedback to evaluate the support they received in accessing accommodation after release.

Education, training and employment

- 4.32** Arrangements for resettlement into education, training and work were good. The quality of the National Careers Service provided by Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire Partnership Ltd was good. NCS staff worked well with Jobcentre Plus and other agencies to support prisoners' resettlement needs. Prisoners were given good support for writing curriculum vitae and job applications, but job search facilities were limited. On the open site, access to the virtual campus (providing prisoner access to community education, training and employment opportunities via the internet) was hampered by its position in the education department and not always accessible. On the closed site, it was not used effectively to improve learning or help prisoners search for jobs or support learning. There was a useful employability course on both sites to help prisoners gain knowledge and understanding of the skills they needed to succeed in work on release.
- 4.33** There were good links with a variety of employers, which were used particularly effectively for prisoners on the open site to gain useful ROTL experience and jobs. A good proportion of prisoners from the open site attended work or college courses in the community. The prison could not provide accurate figures on the number of prisoners released into employment, education or training.

Recommendation

- 4.34** **All prisoners should have access to the virtual campus to support their learning, education and employability.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.35** The prison should keep accurate figures on the number of prisoners released to education, training or employment.

Health care

- 4.36** There were good and timely arrangements for the discharge of patients. Information was provided on NHS services, and prescriptions for medication up to seven days supplied when required. Patients with enduring mental health problems were not managed using the care programme approach (see recommendation 2.105) and so there were no relevant arrangements for outside community mental health teams. There were good arrangements for palliative care and end-of-life procedures for patients.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.37** The integrated substance misuse service (ISMS) had good links with community substance misuse agencies in several areas. Workers from some of these organisations attended both sites to meet prisoners before their release. Prisoners on the open site could apply for ROTL to visit community services.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.38** There was a range of support on financial matters, including regular access to Citizens Advice and Jobcentre Plus, and links to other community organisations. This support covered both sites, and the service was comprehensive. Prisoners on both sites could open a bank account, although the uptake was relatively low because they needed to have at least six months left to serve. Prisoners on the open site reported, and our survey confirmed, that too few prisoners knew of the support available; only 34%, against the comparator of 51%, said they knew of anyone in the prison who could help them with benefits, and only 27%, against 43%, with financial matters.

Housekeeping points

- 4.39** Financial support services should be better promoted to prisoners and information about them prominently displayed on both sites.
- 4.40** Prisoners with less than six months to serve should be able to open a bank account if needed.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.41** Dedicated family workers offered a range of innovative family interventions for prisoners and their families on both sites, including a specific parenting course for prisoners on the closed site. Since April 2013, there have been 134 applications to this course and eight programmes had been completed. Delays in public protection and security checks by prison staff had reduced the numbers of prisoners cleared to attend these courses. Family workers offered supervised play provision, creative craft clubs, and two-hour family visits on both sites.

- 4.42** The children and families department provided effective links between prisoners and families through liaison with external agencies, such as social services. For example, the team arranged and supervised contact and goodbye visits for prisoners whose children were looked after or going into care. The team was well managed, and represented at the senior management team by the managing chaplain.
- 4.43** The visitors' centre for the closed site had a positive focus on supporting visitors and encouraging the maintenance of family ties, and provided good support for first-time visitors with a wide range of information. In our survey, more prisoners than the comparator in the closed prison said that staff had supported them to maintain contact with their family or friends. The visitors' centre also offered employment opportunities to prisoners from the open site, with cleaning and maintenance and work in the canteen.
- 4.44** Visit starts were often delayed on the closed site. The visits hall on the closed site was large and pleasant, but the play area needed renovation. Visits arrangements were good on the open site, with a relaxed atmosphere inside the large main entrance hall or outside on the patio during good weather. Prisoners were generally content with visits booking arrangements.

Recommendation

- 4.45** **The play area in the closed site visits hall should be renovated with new equipment purchased.**

Housekeeping points

- 4.46** Security and public protection checks for applicants to the parenting courses should be completed promptly.
- 4.47** Visits should start on time.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.48** In our survey, almost two-thirds of respondents on the closed site said that they had completed an offending behaviour programme at Hewell. The Thinking Skills Programme (TSP) continued to be delivered to high standards. The Focus on Resettlement programme had been introduced and was running regularly. The resettlement fair at the end of each course was very successful. At the fair held during the inspection, 323 prisoners visited stalls provided by 33 external resettlement agencies, as well as agencies working in the prison. This was a useful initiative in view of Hewell's designation as a resettlement prison. There had been some dropouts from both these programmes in the current year. The offender management process was not working well in identifying suitable candidates, and the programmes staff were having to build their own methods of finding candidates (see recommendation 4.16).
- 4.49** The SORI (supporting offenders through rehabilitation inside) course continued to run very effectively, triggering motivation to change through awareness of the impact of crime on victims. A prisoner community had been formed, with trained staff, on one wing to consolidate the restorative justice principles in everyday prison life. A small restorative justice team was also applying mediation to support conflict resolution and diversion from formal disciplinary measures across the prison.

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

The following is a listing of repeated and new recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice included in this report. The reference numbers at the end of each refer to the paragraph location in the main report, and in the previous report where recommendations have been repeated.

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1 Managers should investigate and address the underlying causes of violent behaviour, including debt-related bullying. Rigorous violence reduction procedures should be in place, and all allegations of assault by staff should be investigated thoroughly and promptly, and fully recorded. (S42)
- 5.2 All prisoners in the segregation unit should have detailed care and reintegration plans, based on an initial and continuing assessment of their risks and needs, specific time-bound targets and access to as full a regime as possible. (S43)
- 5.3 Prisoners should be unlocked and engaged in constructive activity during the working day. The number and quality of employment and other activity places should be increased and fully used. (S44)
- 5.4 Offender assessment system (OASys) assessments for prisoners who arrive at the open site should be reviewed so that their levels of risk in open conditions are well understood and inform sentence planning and temporary release objectives. Public protection processes should include a check with the appropriate community contact of the prisoner's MAPPA risk level six months before release and during consideration for temporary release. (S45)

Recommendation

To the Home Office

- 5.5 Immigration detainees should not be held in prisons other than in exceptional circumstances following risk assessment. (2.40)

Recommendation

To Prisoner Escort and Custody Services

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.6 Prisoners' property should accompany them to court and during transfer. (1.4)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.7 Category D new arrivals should be transferred directly to the open site and no longer accommodated on the closed site. (1.12)

- 5.8** The holding rooms in reception should be decorated, kept clean and have adequate reading material and seating, and prisoners should not be held in them for long periods. (1.13)
- 5.9** All new arrivals should receive a first night assessment and appropriate first night checks, and they should be accommodated in clean and well-prepared cells. (1.14)
- 5.10** All prisoners should receive an induction soon after arrival, and the programme for open site prisoners should include a full introduction to open conditions. (1.15)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.11** Assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documentation should demonstrate consistent staff care for prisoners at risk of self-harm. Support arrangements should include good quality care planning and multidisciplinary reviews. (1.36)
- 5.12** The Listener suites should be in an appropriate condition and ready to accommodate a prisoner in crisis and a Listener. (1.37)
- 5.13** The gated cells in segregation should not be used solely to prevent self-harming. (1.38, repeated recommendation 3.47)

Safeguarding

- 5.14** The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.41)

Security

- 5.15** Prisoners should only be strip-searched following a risk assessment. (1.52)
- 5.16** The security team should act on information from security information reports promptly and develop stronger links with other key departments. (1.53)
- 5.17** Closed visits should be authorised only when there is significant risk justified by security intelligence, and prisoners and visitors should be told about appeal procedures. (1.54)
- 5.18** There should be a drug and alcohol supply reduction strategy that includes the application of a consistent testing regime, including weekend and risk-based testing. (1.55)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.19** Prisoners should be able to contribute to their incentives and earned privileges (IEP) reviews, and be informed in writing of the action they need to take to progress. Decisions to demote prisoners should be fair, clearly justified and based on patterns of behaviour. (1.60)
- 5.20** The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme should be linked to the sentence planning process, and should be used to challenge prisoners to achieve agreed targets. (1.61, repeated recommendation 1.57)

Discipline

- 5.21** There should be detailed analyses of all disciplinary procedures, including adjudications, use of force and segregation. (1.68)
- 5.22** Collective punishments should not be threatened or used. (1.69)
- 5.23** There should be quality assurance of all use of force incidents as soon as possible after the incident, with fuller discussion at the use of force meetings. (1.74)
- 5.24** The use of special accommodation should be fully documented, including the reasons why a prisoner is located there, and prisoners should be moved as soon as they are compliant. (1.75)

Substance misuse

- 5.25** The integrated substance misuse service (ISMS) should be sufficiently resourced to deliver timely clinical reviews, recovery-focused treatment, and contracted one-to-one and group-work interventions. (1.85)
- 5.26** A strategic action plan should be developed and reviewed at the monthly drug strategy meeting. (1.86)
- 5.27** Prisoners on the open site should have access to ISMS services in the evening and at weekends, and to a weekly Alcoholics Anonymous meeting. (1.87)

Residential units

- 5.28** Standards of cleanliness in all areas should be significantly improved and maintained and facilities refurbished to an acceptable standard. (2.10, repeated recommendation HP48)
- 5.29** Single cells should not be used for double occupancy. (2.11, repeated recommendation 2.8)
- 5.30** Dormitory accommodation on the open site should be refurbished and offer appropriate levels of privacy and space. (2.12, repeated recommendation 2.9)
- 5.31** Prisoners should have keys to lock their own cells, or officers should lock cells without delay when prisoners leave the wing. (2.13)
- 5.32** Staff should respond to cell call bells within five minutes. (2.14)
- 5.33** Every prisoner application should receive a substantive response within a fixed timescale. (2.15)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.34** There should be regular checks on each prisoner by a named member of staff who is aware of his individual needs and provides support. A good quality record of contact should be maintained. (2.24)
- 5.35** Effective prisoner consultation arrangements should be developed on both sites. (2.25)

Equality and diversity

- 5.36** The prison should extend equality monitoring to include all protected characteristics. (2.31, repeated recommendation 2.24)
- 5.37** Discrimination incident reporting forms should be investigated within a reasonable timescale and prisoners informed of the outcome in writing. Effective quality assurance procedures should be put in place. (2.32, repeated recommendation 2.25)
- 5.38** Minority groups should be systematically identified, supported and consulted, to ensure that their needs are assessed, negative perceptions understood and inequalities of treatment addressed. Dedicated support forums should be in place. (2.39)
- 5.39** Foreign nationals should have access to independent immigration advice and to telephone interpreting where necessary, especially for confidential matters. (2.41)
- 5.40** Prisoners who need one should have a paid carer and a care plan. (2.42)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.41** The prison should investigate prisoners' views and needs related to faith and religion to inform the provision of faith activities. (2.48)

Complaints

- 5.42** All complaints, including confidential access complaints, should be investigated fully and promptly, and monitored by the senior management team. (2.56)

Legal rights

- 5.43** Legal services officers should be sufficiently trained, and information about legal services should be prominently displayed. (2.61)
- 5.44** Legal visits should start on time, and prisoners should have adequate waiting facilities. (2.62)

Health services

- 5.45** All health care staff should complete annual mandatory training, and custody staff should be trained in the use of defibrillators. (2.72)
- 5.46** Prisoners' access to health services should be significantly improved: they should not have to wait more than two weeks for routine GP appointments, and there should be sufficient officers to ensure that they can attend booked health care appointments inside the prison and at outside hospitals. (2.81)
- 5.47** Prisoners should only be admitted to the inpatient unit for their health care needs. (2.82)
- 5.48** The inpatient unit should provide a regime that supports a therapeutic environment, and cells should be clean, well decorated and maintained. (2.83)
- 5.49** Pharmacy-led clinics and medicine use reviews should be introduced. (2.90, repeated 2.81)
- 5.50** Secure lockable medicines storage facilities should be provided for all prisoners who receive their medication in possession. (2.91, repeated recommendation 2.80)

- 5.51** Medicine administration should take place at clinically appropriate times and be appropriately supervised by prison officers. (2.92)
- 5.52** The reason a patient does not receive medication should be recorded, and there should be a robust process for following up patients. (2.93)
- 5.53** The use of patient group directions should be expanded to allow the supply of a wider range of medicines by registered nurses. (2.94)
- 5.54** Patients receiving secondary mental health care should be seen by a named nurse to ensure the continuity of their care. (2.104)
- 5.55** The care programme approach should be used for the management of patients with enduring mental health problems. (2.105)
- 5.56** Prisoners should have access to professional counselling services. (2.106, repeated recommendation 2.91)
- 5.57** Mental health awareness training should be delivered to all prison staff. (2.107, repeated recommendation 2.92)

Catering

- 5.58** On the closed site, breakfast packs should be more substantial and served on the day they are to be eaten, food and drink should be in date, and fresh fruit should be offered every day. (2.113)
- 5.59** All prisoners should be able to eat communally, and more of those on the open site should be able to cook for themselves. (2.114)

Purchases

- 5.60** Prisoners should be able to buy items from the prison shop within 24 hours of arrival, and receive their shop orders within seven days thereafter. (2.118)
- 5.61** The prison should ensure that goods in prisoners' shop orders are not removed at any stage of the packing, delivery and distribution process. (2.119)

Time out of cell

- 5.62** All prisoners should be given an hour's exercise outside each day. (3.4, repeated recommendation 3.4)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.63** The prison should ensure that all information gained about prisoners at induction is used effectively to place them in appropriate activities that best suit their needs. (3.12)
- 5.64** Observations of teaching, learning and assessment by the OLASS provider should be better recorded and extended to include all areas of learning and skills, and used to share best practice. (3.13)

- 5.65** Learning and skills data collection and analysis should be improved to inform decision-making and target-setting, and the prison's learning and skills self-assessment should be of sufficient quality to aid quality improvement. (3.14)
- 5.66** There should be a wider range of education courses and employment opportunities for the more able and longer-term prisoners, more work opportunities for vulnerable prisoners, and better promotion of Open University and distance learning courses. (3.18)
- 5.67** The quality of teaching should be improved to ensure that all learners experience consistently good teaching, learning and assessment. (3.21)
- 5.68** There should be better monitoring of the quality of provision to improve pass rates in qualifications that have low achievements. (3.24)
- 5.69** All prisoners allocated to activities should arrive on time. (3.25)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.70** Recreational sessions should not be cancelled. (3.34)

Offender management and planning

- 5.71** Offender supervisors should have time to manage prisoners' sentences appropriately, and oversee achievement of sentence plan and resettlement targets. (4.16)
- 5.72** All eligible prisoners should have a sentence plan and OASys assessments should be completed on time. (4.17, repeated recommendation 4.13)
- 5.73** All relevant prisoners should have a good quality risk management plan that addresses the risk they pose in prison and on release. (4.18)
- 5.74** Interdepartmental risk management team meetings should identify all the risk factors relevant to release plans, and actions agreed at previous meetings should be consistently implemented. (4.22)

Reintegration planning

- 5.75** All prisoners should have access to the virtual campus to support their learning, education and employability. (4.34)
- 5.76** The play area in the closed site visits hall should be renovated with new equipment purchased. (4.45)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

- 5.77** The reception searching area should be well screened and offer sufficient privacy. (1.16)
- 5.78** Peer resettlement workers should be monitored and supervised by prison staff. (1.17)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.79** The safer custody team should accurately record all incidents and indicators of violence, including threats, allegations of bullying and unexplained injuries. (1.25)
- 5.80** The safer custody team should survey prisoners' perceptions of safety annually. (1.26)

Safeguarding

- 5.81** The safeguarding policy should be updated to include the Department of Health's definition of an at-risk adult in its *No Secrets* report. (1.42)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.82** Staff should be consistent in recording entries about positive and negative behaviour in prisoner records. (1.62)

Discipline

- 5.83** There should be quality assurance of adjudications. (1.70)

Substance misuse

- 5.84** ISMS peer supporters should be promptly unlocked to attend prisoners whenever they need support. (1.88)

Residential units

- 5.85** The sharp edges of the metal bunks on house block 3 should be made safe. (2.16)
- 5.86** Legal correspondence should not be opened without prisoners being present or giving their express permission. (2.17)

Equality and diversity

- 5.87** Foreign national prisoners should be informed that they can have monthly telephone calls and letters in exchange for visits. (2.43)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.88** The multi-faith areas should be kept clean. (2.49)
- 5.89** Chaplaincy staff should be notified of and invited to ACCT reviews for prisoners they have supported. (2.50)

Complaints

- 5.90** There should be separate analyses of complaints and any trends for the closed and open sites. (2.57)

Health services

- 5.91** All clinical rooms should comply with the control of infection criteria. (2.73)
- 5.92** The health promotion action group should meet regularly. (2.74)
- 5.93** Registers and signing procedures should comply with current pharmacy regulations. (2.95)

Offender management and planning

- 5.94** The submission of parole dossiers should be monitored to ensure that they are within time. (4.25)

Reintegration planning

- 5.95** Prisoner resettlement workers should not have access to confidential personal information on other prisoners. (4.30)
- 5.96** The prison should keep accurate figures on the number of prisoners released to education, training or employment. (4.35)
- 5.97** Financial support services should be better promoted to prisoners and information about them prominently displayed on both sites. (4.39)
- 5.98** Prisoners with less than six months to serve should be able to open a bank account if needed. (4.40)
- 5.99** Security and public protection checks for applicants to the parenting courses should be completed promptly. (4.46)
- 5.100** Visits should start on time. (4.47)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief inspector
Hindpal Singh Bhui	Team leader
Colin Carroll	Inspector
Sarah Cutler	Inspector
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Fionnuala Gordon	Inspector
Francesca Gordon	Inspector
Martin Kettle	Inspector
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Samantha Galisteo	Senior researcher
Rachel Murray	Researcher
Alissa Redmond	Researcher
Caroline Elwood	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Mick Bowen	Health services inspector
Nicola Rabjohns	Health services inspector
Jan Fooks-Bale	Care Quality Commission
Richard Chapman	Pharmacist
Rachel O'Callaghan	Pharmacist
Neil Edwards	Ofsted inspector
Richard Beaumont	Ofsted inspector
Rieks Drijver	Ofsted inspector
Krystyna Findley	Offender management inspector
Iolo Madoc-Jones	Offender management inspector
Helen Rinaldi	Offender management inspector
Ian Simpkins	Offender management inspector

Observers

Femke Hofstee-van der Meulen	Inspector, Inspectorate of Security and Justice, The Netherlands
Sandra Imhof	Head, Swiss National Commission for the Prevention of Torture

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 2012, reception processes were reasonable but searching procedures were degrading. Most first night support was good but new prisoners were not monitored after they had been locked up. Induction was mixed. Most prisoners felt safe but more than we would expect to see did not; some also felt victimised by staff. Work on violence reduction and suicide and self-harm was inadequate. The number of prisoner-on-prisoner assaults was high and data and trend analysis around safety, including suicide and self-harm prevention was poor. The anti-bullying policy was not used effectively and not all poor behaviour was being robustly challenged. Security arrangements were improving but there were still significant weaknesses. The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy was not being adhered to and some arbitrary decisions were being made. The positive mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate was high, but there were early signs of improvement. More prisoners than at comparator prisons said that it was easy to get illegal drugs. Segregation offered a very basic regime. Use of force was proportionate. Data and trend analysis about disciplinary matters was poor. Substance misuse services had improved and were now good. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

Staff should actively engage with and supervise prisoners so that anti-social behaviour is challenged, violence reduction policies are consistently implemented and risks to prisoner safety are identified and reduced. (HP45)

Partially achieved

A drug and alcohol supply reduction strategy should be developed/reviewed which should include the application of a consistent testing regime, effective use of intelligence and coordination between the relevant departments. (HP46)

Not achieved

Monitoring data about safety issues, including violence reduction, findings from investigations about self-harm incidents and deaths in custody should be effectively collated and used to inform the local strategy to improve safety overall. (HP47)

Achieved

Recommendations

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

Achieved

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

Partially achieved

The closed site reception area should be refurbished and well maintained. (1.14, repeated recommendation 1.42)

Partially achieved

Category D prisoners should be transferred directly to the open site and the practice of accommodating them on the closed site and routine strip-searching should cease. (1.15)

Not achieved

Initial safety screening interviews should be conducted in private. (1.16)

Achieved

Squat searches should only take place exceptionally when authorised by a manager on the basis of a risk assessment. (1.17)

Achieved

First night cells should be clean and properly prepared for occupation. (1.18)

Not achieved

Night staff should speak to and know the location of all new prisoners and be aware of any specific needs they might have at both sites. (1.19)

Not achieved

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

Not achieved

The gated cells in segregation should not be used solely to prevent self-harming. (1.36, repeated recommendation 3.47)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation 1.38)

The prison should provide telephones so that prisoners can contact the Samaritans in private. (1.37)

Achieved

ACCT reviews including those post-closure should take place on time and there should be appropriate multidisciplinary attendance. (1.38)

Partially achieved

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

Not achieved

The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme should be linked to the sentence planning process, and should be used to challenge prisoners to achieve agreed targets. (1.57, repeated recommendation 7.43).

Not achieved (repeated recommendation 1.61)

Decisions to demote prisoners to the basic level should be fair, based on patterns of behaviour and always justified; outcomes should be monitored to ensure this happens. (1.58)

Not achieved

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

Not achieved

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

Not achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2012, many areas were filthy and poorly maintained and as a consequence provided a deplorable living space. Some accommodation was unsuitable. Cleaning materials were often unavailable. Staff-prisoner relationships were generally polite but often somewhat distant. Staff did not sufficiently challenge poor behaviour. Diversity needed better coordination and there were some gaps in provision. Services for foreign national prisoners were good, as was faith provision. Prisoners lacked confidence in the applications and complaints processes. Health services were reasonably good. Prisoners did not like the food. There could be unacceptable delays in receiving the first canteen order. Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

Standards of cleanliness in all areas should be significantly improved and maintained and facilities refurbished to an acceptable standard. (HP48)

Partially achieved (repeated recommendation 2.10)

Recommendations

Single cells should not be used for double occupancy. (2.8, repeated recommendation 2.21)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation 2.11)

Dormitory accommodation on the open site should be refurbished and offer appropriate levels of privacy and space. (2.9)

Partially achieved (repeated recommendation 2.12)

The applications system should be monitored and quality assured by managers. (2.10)

Not achieved

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

Not achieved

The prison should extend equality monitoring to include all protected characteristics. (2.24)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation 2.31)

Discrimination incident reporting forms should be investigated within a reasonable timescale and prisoners informed of the outcome in writing. Effective quality assurance procedures should be put in place. (2.25)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation 2.32)

Telephone interpreting services should be used for confidential prisoner matters including health care screenings and adjudications. (2.36)

Partially achieved

A range of appropriate wing-based activities should be available for older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities. (2.37)

Partially achieved

Personal emergency evacuation plans should be drawn up for those who need them and staff should be aware of those who require assistance. (2.38)

Achieved

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

Not achieved

Patient access to a GP for a routine appointment should be within an acceptable waiting time of less than two weeks. (2.62)

Not achieved

Disabled patients should be able to access the health care centre. (2.63)

Partially achieved

Risk assessments for all patients receiving their medication in possession should be included on SystmOne. (2.77)

Achieved

All areas where medication is administered should be secured by a double-gated system. (2.78)

Achieved

All medicines should be administered from their original packaging or from that labelled for a specific patient in accordance with current regulations. (2.79)

Achieved

Secure lockable medicines storage facilities should be provided for all prisoners who receive their medication in possession. (2.80)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation 2.91)

Pharmacy-led clinics and medicine use reviews should be introduced. (2.81)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation 2.90)

Day care services should be available for prisoners who need additional therapeutic support for emotional, behavioural and mental health problems. (2.90)

No longer relevant

Prisoners should have access to professional counselling services. (2.91)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation 2.106)

Mental health awareness training should be delivered to all prison staff. (2.92)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation 2.107)

There should be facilities to allow prisoners to eat their meals out of their cells on the closed site. (2.97)

Achieved

Prisoners in the open site annexes should have opportunities to cook for themselves. (2.98)

Partially achieved

Fresh fruit should be available through the prison shop. (2.104, repeated recommendation (8.16)

Partially achieved

New prisoners should have access to a full canteen order after arrival at the prison. (2.105)

Not achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2012, too many prisoners were locked up during the working day and there was significant slippage in the regime. Time out of cell at the open site was good. For those involved in activities, the management of learning and skills and quality of education and vocational training was good. There was a good range of opportunities at the open site; however, on the closed site, where unemployment was high, opportunities were very limited and were particularly poor for vulnerable prisoners. Qualifications achievement for a small number was high. Attendance and punctuality at education in the closed site was poor and the activity allocation process was being undermined. Library services were good. Access to the gym was good for many but we were concerned it was underused by vulnerable prisoners. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

Sufficient activity places should be provided at the closed site so that all sentenced prisoners can be fully engaged. (HP49)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

All prisoners should be given an hour's exercise outside each day. (3.4, repeated recommendation 6.63)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation 3.4)

The core day should be adhered to and regime activities maximised, including for those beyond retirement age, to ensure the minimum number of prisoners are left locked up during the working day. (3.5)

Not achieved

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

Achieved

The learning and skills and work provision for vulnerable prisoners should be sufficient to meet their individual learning needs in preparation for further training and/or employment. (3.16)

Partially achieved

Punctuality and attendance at education classes should be improved by more efficient action by prison staff to ensure prisoners attend classes. (3.27)

Not achieved

The new systems for recognising and recording non-accredited skills gained by prisoners in prison work areas and working out should be fully implemented. (3.28, repeated recommendation 6.34)

Partially achieved

The PE provision should undergo a review to ensure staffing is being used efficiently and effectively and that it is better meeting the needs of the population and supporting prisoners in preparing for employment in the fitness industry. (3.37)

Partially achieved

Vulnerable prisoners should have access to the same number of PE sessions as other prisoners (3.38, repeated recommendation 6.49)

Achieved

The internal deterioration of the PE building on the open site should be improved. (3.39)

Not 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 2012, some good strategic work had been carried out to shape provision according to prisoners' needs. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was used at the open site for a good variety of activities although the number going out to work and college was relatively low. Offender management appropriately targeted higher risk cases and for these prisoners contact with offender supervisors was regular, although it was much more limited for other groups. Assessments and target setting were reasonable but there was a backlog in the completion of assessments. There was no custody planning for short-term prisoners but their needs were assessed. Public protection arrangements were appropriate and categorisation and home detention curfew (HDC) work was good. Work with indeterminate sentence prisoners at the open site was good. There were some gaps in programme provision but there was a good range of support in the resettlement pathways. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

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

Partially achieved

All eligible prisoners should have a sentence plan and OASYS assessments should be completed on time. (4.13)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation 4.17)

There should be ongoing recorded contact with all prisoners to oversee the achievement of sentence plans and resettlement targets. (4.14)

Not achieved

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

Partially achieved

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

Not achieved

Visits should start at the advertised time. (4.45, repeated recommendation 9.109)

Not achieved

Closed visits should be authorised only when there is significant risk justified by security intelligence. (4.46, repeated recommendation 9.110)

Not achieved

Visitors should be able to book their next visit while they are at the establishment (4.47 repeated recommendation 9.106)

No longer relevant

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

Not achieved

Appendix IIIa: Prison population profile – closed site

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

Status	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	1	580	53.9
Recall	0	111	10.3
Convicted unsentenced	0	134	12.4
Remand	0	243	22.6
Detainees	0	5	0.5
Other	0	3	0.3
Total	1	1076	100

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	0	393	36.7
Less than six months	0	89	8.3
Six months to less than 12 months	0	50	4.6
12 months to less than 2 years	0	93	8.6
2 years to less than 3 years	0	92	8.5
3 years to less than 4 years	0	59	5.5
4 years to less than 10 years	1	161	15.0
10 years and over (not life)	0	55	5.1
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	0	43	7.6
Life	0	41	4.0
Total	1	1076	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Under 21 years	1	0.1
21 years to 29 years	442	41.0
30 years to 39 years	378	35.1
40 years to 49 years	175	16.2
50 years to 59 years	62	5.8
60 years to 69 years	13	1.2
70 plus years: maximum age=82	6	0.6
Total	1077	

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	0	952	88.4
Foreign nationals	1	104	9.7
Not Stated	0	20	1.9
Total	1	1076	100

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	0	76	7.1
Uncategorised sentenced	0	410	38.1
Category B	0	113	10.5
Category C	0	397	36.9
Category D	0	68	6.3
Other	0	6	0.6
YOI closed	1	6	0.6
Total			100

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	0	727	67.5
Irish	0	5	0.5
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	0	6	0.6
Other white	0	38	3.5
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	0	33	3.1
White and black African	0	1	0.1
White and Asian	0	4	0.4
Other mixed	0	5	0.5
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	0	36	3.3
Pakistani	0	21	1.9
Bangladeshi	0	3	0.3
Other Asian	0	17	1.6
Black or black British			
Caribbean	0	78	7.2
African	0	15	1.4
Other black	0	22	2.0
Other ethnic group			
Arab	0	1	0.8
Other ethnic group	0	9	0.1
Not stated	0	55	5.1
Total	1	1076	100

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Church of England	0	200	18.6
Roman Catholic	1	156	14.6
Other Christian denominations	0	107	9.9
Muslim	0	97	9.0
Sikh	0	23	2.1
Hindu	0	5	0.5
Buddhist	0	14	1.3
Jewish	0	1	0.1
Other	0	6	0.6
No religion	0	380	35.3
Not stated	0	87	8.1
Total	1	1076	100

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	1	0.1	156	14.5
1 month to 3 months	0	0	199	18.5
3 months to six months	0	0	121	11.2
Six months to 1 year	0	0	146	13.6
1 year to 2 years	0	0	52	4.8
2 years to 4 years	0	0	6	0.6
4 years or more	0	0	1	0.1
Total	1	0.1	681	63.2

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/ restrictions).	0	423	39.3
Total	0	423	39.3

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	21 and over	
	Number	%
Less than 1 month	142	13.2
1 month to 3 months	132	12.3
3 months to six months	83	7.7
Six months to 1 year	34	3.2
1 year to 2 years	2	0.2
2 years to 4 years	2	0.2
4 years or more	0	0.0
Total	395	36.7

Main offence	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	345	32.03
Sexual offences	98	9.09
Burglary	166	15.41
Robbery	125	11.6
Theft and handling	89	8.26
Fraud and forgery	28	2.59
Drugs offences	111	10.35
Other offences	82	7.61
Offence not recorded /holding warrant	33	3.06
Total		

Appendix IIIb: Prison population profile – open site

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

Status	21 and over	%
Sentenced	193	99.0
Recall	2	1.0
Total	195	100

Sentence	21 and over	%
12 months to less than 2 years	4	2.1
2 years to less than 3 years	8	4.1
3 years to less than 4 years	22	11.3
4 years to less than 10 years	112	57.4
10 years and over (not life)	20	10.3
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	17	8.7
Life	12	14.9
Total		

Age	Number of prisoners	%
21 years to 29 years	61	31.3
30 years to 39 years	70	35.9
40 years to 49 years	38	20.0
50 years to 59 years	21	10.8
60 years to 69 years	3	1.5
70 plus years: <i>maximum age=72</i>	1	0.5
Total		

Nationality	21 and over	%
British	193	99.0
Foreign nationals	2	1.0
Total	195	100

Security category	21 and over	%
Category C	6	3.1
Category D	189	96.9
Total	195	100

Ethnicity	21 and over	%
White		
British	100	51.3
Other white	4	2.1
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	5	2.6
White and black African	2	1.0
White and Asian	2	1.0
Asian or Asian British		
Indian	16	8.2
Pakistani	23	11.8
Bangladeshi	3	1.5
Other Asian	7	3.6

Black or black British		
Caribbean	18	9.2
African	3	1.5
Other black	6	3.1
Other ethnic group	1	0.5
Not stated	5	2.6
Total	195	100

Religion	21 and over	%
Church of England	35	17.9
Roman Catholic	20	10.3
Other Christian denominations	15	7.7
Muslim	47	24.1
Sikh	10	5.1
Hindu	2	1.0
Buddhist	6	3.1
Other	7	3.6
No religion	52	26.7
Not stated	1	0.5
Total	195	100

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	21 and over	
	Number	%
Less than 1 month	11	5.6
1 month to 3 months	45	23.1
3 months to six months	53	27.2
Six months to 1 year	59	30.3
1 year to 2 years	25	12.8
2 years to 4 years	2	1.0
Total	195	100

Sentenced prisoners only

	21 and over	%
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/ restrictions).	89	45.6
Total	89	45.6

Main offence	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	42	21.64
Burglary	13	6.70
Robbery	29	14.94
Theft and handling	4	2.06
Fraud and forgery	21	10.82
Drugs offences	59	30.41
Other offences	25	12.88
Civil offences	1	0.51
Total		

Appendix IVa: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews – closed site

Prisoner survey methodology

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

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 establishment. Respondents were then randomly selected from a P-Nomis prisoner population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. We also ensured that the proportion of black and minority ethnic prisoners in the sample reflected the proportion in the prison as a whole.

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 7 and 8 April 2014 the prisoner population at HMP Hewell (closed) was 1088. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 217 prisoners.

We received a total of 164 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 76%. This included two questionnaires completed via interview. Nine respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 34 questionnaires were not returned and 11 were returned blank.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
1	29
2	18
3	34
4	32
5	12
6	32

Segregation	4
Health care	3

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP Hewell (closed site).

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 differences 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 Hewell (closed) in 2014 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 33 local prisons since April 2008.
- The current survey responses from HMP Hewell (closed) in 2014 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Hewell (closed) in 2012.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.

Survey summary

Section I: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>		3 (2%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>		62 (38%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>		56 (34%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>		33 (20%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>		6 (4%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>		2 (1%)
	<i>70 and over</i>		1 (1%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>		71 (44%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>		30 (18%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>		37 (23%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>		23 (14%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>		2 (1%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	<i>Not sentenced</i>		62 (39%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>		19 (12%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>		8 (5%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>		12 (8%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>		12 (8%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>		22 (14%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>		6 (4%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>		10 (6%)
	<i>Life</i>		8 (5%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)		
	<i>Yes</i>		15 (9%)
	<i>No</i>		145 (91%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		159 (97%)
	<i>No</i>		5 (3%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		158 (97%)
	<i>No</i>		5 (3%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	106 (67%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>White - other</i>	6 (4%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 15 (9%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	10 (6%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	4 (3%)	<i>Arab</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	4 (3%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	1 (1%)	

Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
	Yes		9 (6%)
	No		145 (94%)
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	None	48 (30%)	Hindu 1 (1%)
	Church of England	46 (28%)	Jewish 0 (0%)
	Catholic	35 (22%)	Muslim 14 (9%)
	Protestant	1 (1%)	Sikh 3 (2%)
	Other Christian denomination	7 (4%)	Other 2 (1%)
	Buddhist	5 (3%)	
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	Heterosexual/ Straight		152 (97%)
	Homosexual/Gay		2 (1%)
	Bisexual		2 (1%)
Q1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs.)		
	Yes		37 (23%)
	No		124 (77%)
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?		
	Yes		11 (7%)
	No		150 (93%)
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	Yes		44 (27%)
	No		117 (73%)
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	Yes		102 (64%)
	No		58 (36%)

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		116 (71%)
	2 hours or longer		36 (22%)
	Don't remember		12 (7%)
Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?		
	My journey was less than two hours		116 (71%)
	Yes		19 (12%)
	No		23 (14%)
	Don't remember		5 (3%)
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?		
	My journey was less than two hours		116 (71%)
	Yes		2 (1%)
	No		42 (26%)
	Don't remember		4 (2%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?		
	Yes		83 (51%)
	No		69 (43%)
	Don't remember		10 (6%)

Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	113 (70%)
	No	44 (27%)
	Don't remember	5 (3%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well	38 (23%)
	Well	64 (39%)
	Neither	44 (27%)
	Badly	9 (6%)
	Very badly	5 (3%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	104 (64%)
	Yes, I received written information	8 (5%)
	No, I was not told anything	45 (28%)
	Don't remember	10 (6%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	119 (73%)
	No	40 (24%)
	Don't remember	5 (3%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?			
	Less than 2 hours	53 (32%)		
	2 hours or longer	100 (61%)		
	Don't remember	11 (7%)		
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?			
	Yes	122 (76%)		
	No	32 (20%)		
	Don't remember	6 (4%)		
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?			
	Very well	25 (15%)		
	Well	71 (44%)		
	Neither	38 (23%)		
	Badly	18 (11%)		
	Very badly	8 (5%)		
	Don't remember	3 (2%)		
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	Loss of property	36 (22%)	Physical health	34 (21%)
	Housing problems	29 (18%)	Mental health	42 (26%)
	Contacting employers	5 (3%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	12 (7%)
	Contacting family	46 (29%)	Getting telephone numbers	51 (32%)
	Childcare	4 (2%)	Other	10 (6%)
	Money worries	29 (18%)	Did not have any problems	39 (24%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal	37 (23%)		

Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?	
	Yes	43 (27%)
	No	77 (48%)
	Did not have any problems	39 (25%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Tobacco	126 (77%)
	A shower	17 (10%)
	A free telephone call	124 (76%)
	Something to eat	107 (66%)
	PIN telephone credit	86 (53%)
	Toiletries/ basic items	79 (48%)
	Did not receive anything	9 (6%)
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Chaplain	64 (41%)
	Someone from health services	111 (72%)
	A Listener/Samaritans	69 (45%)
	Prison shop/ canteen	11 (7%)
	Did not have access to any of these	27 (17%)
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	What was going to happen to you	53 (34%)
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal	55 (35%)
	How to make routine requests (applications)	41 (26%)
	Your entitlement to visits	44 (28%)
	Health services	62 (39%)
	Chaplaincy	48 (31%)
	Not offered any information	54 (34%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes	118 (73%)
	No	37 (23%)
	Don't remember	6 (4%)
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	Have not been on an induction course	50 (31%)
	Within the first week	80 (49%)
	More than a week	23 (14%)
	Don't remember	10 (6%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	Have not been on an induction course	50 (32%)
	Yes	46 (30%)
	No	48 (31%)
	Don't remember	10 (6%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	Did not receive an assessment	49 (32%)
	Within the first week	54 (36%)
	More than a week	34 (22%)
	Don't remember	15 (10%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to.....						
		Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	14 (9%)	45 (30%)	27 (18%)	31 (21%)	26 (17%)	8 (5%)
	Attend legal visits?	16 (12%)	53 (39%)	28 (20%)	16 (12%)	11 (8%)	13 (9%)
	Get bail information?	4 (3%)	13 (10%)	28 (21%)	16 (12%)	29 (22%)	42 (32%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?						
	Not had any letters						20 (13%)
	Yes						84 (54%)
	No						51 (33%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?						
	Yes						59 (38%)
	No						18 (12%)
	Don't know						79 (51%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:						
		Yes	No	Don't know			
	Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	70 (45%)	82 (53%)	4 (3%)			
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	139 (89%)	16 (10%)	1 (1%)			
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	111 (73%)	39 (26%)	2 (1%)			
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	68 (45%)	81 (53%)	3 (2%)			
	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	19 (12%)	129 (84%)	5 (3%)			
	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	90 (59%)	60 (39%)	2 (1%)			
	If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	28 (18%)	82 (54%)	43 (28%)			
Q4.5	What is the food like here?						
	Very good						2 (1%)
	Good						19 (12%)
	Neither						36 (23%)
	Bad						53 (34%)
	Very bad						47 (30%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?						
	Have not bought anything yet/ don't know						11 (7%)
	Yes						72 (46%)
	No						73 (47%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?						
	Yes						90 (58%)
	No						24 (15%)
	Don't know						42 (27%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?						
	Yes						71 (46%)
	No						23 (15%)
	Don't know/ N/A						62 (40%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?						
	Yes						84 (54%)
	No						22 (14%)
	Don't know/ N/A						51 (32%)

Q4.10 How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?

<i>I don't want to attend</i>	22 (14%)
<i>Very easy</i>	19 (12%)
<i>Easy</i>	33 (22%)
<i>Neither</i>	20 (13%)
<i>Difficult</i>	12 (8%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	11 (7%)
<i>Don't know</i>	36 (24%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints**Q5.1 Is it easy to make an application?**

<i>Yes</i>	118 (76%)
<i>No</i>	33 (21%)
<i>Don't know</i>	4 (3%)

Q5.2 Please answer the following questions about applications (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option).

	<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Are applications dealt with fairly?</i>	9 (6%)	59 (40%)	80 (54%)
<i>Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?</i>	9 (7%)	38 (28%)	88 (65%)

Q5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?

<i>Yes</i>	78 (54%)
<i>No</i>	30 (21%)
<i>Don't know</i>	36 (25%)

Q5.4 Please answer the following questions about complaints (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option).

	<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Are complaints dealt with fairly?</i>	62 (40%)	28 (18%)	64 (42%)
<i>Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?</i>	62 (44%)	19 (13%)	61 (43%)

Q5.5 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?

<i>Yes</i>	28 (19%)
<i>No</i>	117 (81%)

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>	60 (41%)
<i>Very easy</i>	9 (6%)
<i>Easy</i>	10 (7%)
<i>Neither</i>	26 (18%)
<i>Difficult</i>	27 (18%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	16 (11%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme**Q6.1 Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)**

<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	32 (21%)
<i>Yes</i>	55 (35%)
<i>No</i>	52 (34%)
<i>Don't know</i>	16 (10%)

Q6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	32 (21%)
	Yes	49 (32%)
	No	54 (36%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	17 (11%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	Yes	9 (6%)
	No	146 (94%)
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	101 (67%)
	Very well	6 (4%)
	Well	14 (9%)
	Neither	15 (10%)
	Badly	8 (5%)
	Very badly	6 (4%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	120 (78%)
	No	34 (22%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	111 (73%)
	No	42 (27%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	38 (25%)
	No	117 (75%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	12 (8%)
	Never	44 (29%)
	Rarely	47 (31%)
	Some of the time	33 (22%)
	Most of the time	9 (6%)
	All of the time	7 (5%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	115 (74%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	13 (8%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	115 (78%)
	Very helpful	11 (7%)
	Helpful	11 (7%)
	Neither	5 (3%)
	Not very helpful	3 (2%)
	Not at all helpful	2 (1%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?		
	Yes		73 (48%)
	No		80 (52%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?		
	Yes		35 (24%)
	No		109 (76%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Never felt unsafe	80 (54%)	<i>At meal times</i> 17 (11%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	24 (16%)	<i>At health services</i> 13 (9%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	11 (7%)	<i>Visits area</i> 14 (9%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	20 (14%)	<i>In wing showers</i> 18 (12%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	12 (8%)	<i>In gym showers</i> 7 (5%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	8 (5%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> 19 (13%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	16 (11%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i> 22 (15%)
	<i>At work</i>	12 (8%)	<i>In your cell</i> 11 (7%)
	<i>During movement</i>	27 (18%)	<i>At religious services</i> 3 (2%)
	<i>At education</i>	6 (4%)	
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?		
	Yes		57 (37%)
	No		98 (63%)
Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>		31 (20%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>		21 (14%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>		9 (6%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>		34 (22%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>		24 (15%)
	<i>Medication</i>		23 (15%)
	<i>Debt</i>		19 (12%)
	<i>Drugs</i>		14 (9%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>		7 (5%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>		5 (3%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>		6 (4%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>		11 (7%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>		3 (2%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>		3 (2%)
	<i>Your age</i>		6 (4%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>		7 (5%)
	<i>You were new here</i>		22 (14%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>		9 (6%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>		11 (7%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?		
	Yes		51 (33%)
	No		102 (67%)
Q8.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>		27 (18%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>		13 (8%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>		7 (5%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>		24 (16%)
	<i>Medication</i>		14 (9%)

Debt	6 (4%)
Drugs	4 (3%)
Your race or ethnic origin	4 (3%)
Your religion/religious beliefs	4 (3%)
Your nationality	6 (4%)
You are from a different part of the country than others	3 (2%)
You are from a traveller community	3 (2%)
Your sexual orientation	2 (1%)
Your age	5 (3%)
You have a disability	6 (4%)
You were new here	8 (5%)
Your offence/ crime	6 (4%)
Gang related issues	5 (3%)

Q8.8 If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?

Not been victimised	82 (61%)
Yes	17 (13%)
No	36 (27%)

Section 9: Health services**Q9.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?:**

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	10 (7%)	6 (4%)	20 (14%)	10 (7%)	60 (41%)	42 (28%)
The nurse	13 (9%)	14 (10%)	44 (30%)	16 (11%)	38 (26%)	20 (14%)
The dentist	21 (14%)	2 (1%)	5 (3%)	7 (5%)	31 (21%)	81 (55%)

Q9.2 What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?:

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	14 (10%)	16 (11%)	31 (21%)	26 (18%)	28 (19%)	32 (22%)
The nurse	12 (8%)	24 (17%)	47 (33%)	20 (14%)	20 (14%)	20 (14%)
The dentist	42 (30%)	7 (5%)	13 (9%)	18 (13%)	24 (17%)	35 (25%)

Q9.3 What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?

Not been	8 (5%)
Very good	17 (11%)
Good	35 (23%)
Neither	22 (15%)
Bad	32 (21%)
Very bad	35 (23%)

Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes	101 (67%)
No	49 (33%)

Q9.5 If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?

Not taking medication	49 (33%)
Yes, all my meds	17 (11%)
Yes, some of my meds	31 (21%)
No	52 (35%)

Q9.6 Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?

Yes	72 (48%)
No	78 (52%)

Q9.7	Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff).	
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	78 (52%)
	Yes	42 (28%)
	No	29 (19%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	54 (36%)
	No	97 (64%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	38 (26%)
	No	110 (74%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	40 (27%)
	Easy	16 (11%)
	Neither	18 (12%)
	Difficult	6 (4%)
	Very difficult	8 (5%)
	Don't know	60 (41%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	17 (11%)
	Easy	9 (6%)
	Neither	24 (16%)
	Difficult	17 (11%)
	Very difficult	10 (7%)
	Don't know	72 (48%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	25 (17%)
	No	123 (83%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	19 (13%)
	No	126 (87%)
Q10.7	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>	83 (60%)
	Yes	33 (24%)
	No	23 (17%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	110 (75%)
	Yes	24 (16%)
	No	12 (8%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	99 (69%)
	Yes	38 (26%)
	No	7 (5%)

Section II: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	13 (9%)	10 (7%)	48 (33%)	25 (17%)	28 (19%)	23 (16%)
	Vocational or skills training	30 (21%)	6 (4%)	40 (28%)	28 (19%)	21 (14%)	20 (14%)
	Education (including basic skills)	20 (14%)	10 (7%)	53 (37%)	31 (22%)	16 (11%)	13 (9%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	48 (34%)	3 (2%)	21 (15%)	24 (17%)	27 (19%)	20 (14%)
Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>						48 (34%)
	Prison job						66 (46%)
	Vocational or skills training						12 (8%)
	Education (including basic skills)						28 (20%)
	Offending behaviour programmes						11 (8%)
Q11.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?						
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>		
	Prison job	28 (20%)	47 (34%)	45 (33%)	18 (13%)		
	Vocational or skills training	35 (34%)	30 (29%)	24 (23%)	15 (14%)		
	Education (including basic skills)	30 (27%)	38 (34%)	25 (23%)	18 (16%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes	36 (35%)	26 (25%)	25 (24%)	17 (16%)		
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						27 (18%)
	<i>Never</i>						39 (26%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i>						41 (28%)
	<i>About once a week</i>						31 (21%)
	<i>More than once a week</i>						11 (7%)
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?						
	<i>Don't use it</i>						44 (30%)
	<i>Yes</i>						43 (30%)
	<i>No</i>						58 (40%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						30 (20%)
	<i>0</i>						50 (33%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>						34 (23%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>						33 (22%)
	<i>More than 5</i>						3 (2%)
Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						19 (13%)
	<i>0</i>						30 (20%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>						49 (33%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>						35 (23%)
	<i>More than 5</i>						16 (11%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						7 (5%)
	<i>0</i>						11 (7%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>						14 (9%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>						31 (21%)
	<i>More than 5</i>						86 (58%)

Q11.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	26 (17%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	42 (28%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	23 (15%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	22 (15%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	13 (9%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	9 (6%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	57 (39%)
	<i>No</i>	91 (61%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	79 (54%)
	<i>No</i>	68 (46%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	33 (22%)
	<i>No</i>	116 (78%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	35 (24%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	10 (7%)
	<i>Easy</i>	33 (22%)
	<i>Neither</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	32 (22%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	24 (16%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (1%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	62 (41%)
	<i>Yes</i>	53 (35%)
	<i>No</i>	37 (24%)
Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Not sentenced/ NA</i>	99 (65%)
	<i>No contact</i>	20 (13%)
	<i>Letter</i>	20 (13%)
	<i>Telephone</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Visit</i>	17 (11%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	35 (24%)
	<i>No</i>	111 (76%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	62 (41%)
	<i>Yes</i>	24 (16%)
	<i>No</i>	66 (43%)

Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			128 (85%)
	<i>Very involved</i>			8 (5%)
	<i>Involved</i>			5 (3%)
	<i>Neither</i>			3 (2%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>			3 (2%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>			4 (3%)
Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that apply to you.)			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			128 (84%)
	<i>Nobody</i>			12 (8%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>			8 (5%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>			11 (7%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>			2 (1%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>			2 (1%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			128 (84%)
	<i>Yes</i>			11 (7%)
	<i>No</i>			10 (7%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			3 (2%)
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			128 (84%)
	<i>Yes</i>			9 (6%)
	<i>No</i>			12 (8%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			3 (2%)
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			128 (84%)
	<i>Yes</i>			16 (11%)
	<i>No</i>			4 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			4 (3%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?			
	<i>Yes</i>			13 (9%)
	<i>No</i>			65 (45%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			66 (46%)
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?			
	<i>Yes</i>			16 (12%)
	<i>No</i>			119 (88%)
Q13.12	Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release?: (please tick all that apply to you.)			
		<i>Do not need help</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
	Employment	28 (21%)	35 (27%)	69 (52%)
	Accommodation	19 (14%)	40 (30%)	73 (55%)
	Benefits	19 (14%)	43 (32%)	71 (53%)
	Finances	21 (17%)	26 (21%)	77 (62%)
	Education	22 (18%)	34 (27%)	69 (55%)
	Drugs and alcohol	24 (18%)	51 (39%)	56 (43%)

Q13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	62 (44%)
	Yes	39 (27%)
	No	41 (29%)

Appendix IVb: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews – open site

Prisoner survey methodology

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

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 establishment. Respondents were then randomly selected from a P-Nomis prisoner population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. We also ensured that the proportion of black and minority ethnic prisoners in the sample reflected the proportion in the prison as a whole.

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 7 and 8 July 2014 the prisoner population at HMP Hewell (open) was 200. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to 191 prisoners⁸.

We received a total of 110 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 58%. Three respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 32 questionnaires were not returned and 46 were returned blank.

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP Hewell (open site).

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%.

⁸ Surveys were not distributed to one prisoner who had been released that day and eight prisoners who were on ROTL on the day of the survey.

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant differences 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 Hewell (open) in 2014 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other open prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 14 open prisons since April 2009.
- The current survey responses from HMP Hewell (open) in 2014 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Hewell (open) in 2012.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2014 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 2014 survey between those aged 50 and over and those under 50.

Survey summary

Section I: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>		31 (28%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>		34 (31%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>		29 (26%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>		13 (12%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>		2 (2%)
	<i>70 and over</i>		1 (1%)
Q1.3	Are you on recall?		
	Yes		0 (0%)
	No		109 (100%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>		2 (2%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>		2 (2%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>		4 (4%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>		10 (9%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>		67 (61%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>		11 (10%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>		8 (7%)
	<i>Life</i>		6 (5%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)		
	Yes		5 (5%)
	No		103 (95%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	Yes		105 (98%)
	No		2 (2%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	Yes		105 (98%)
	No		2 (2%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	51 (53%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	3 (3%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>White - other</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 3 (3%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	11 (11%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 3 (3%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	8 (8%)	<i>Arab</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	13 (14%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	1 (1%)	
Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
	Yes		3 (4%)

	No			82 (96%)
Q1.10	What is your religion?			
	None	23 (24%)	Hindu	2 (2%)
	Church of England	20 (21%)	Jewish	0 (0%)
	Catholic	17 (18%)	Muslim	15 (16%)
	Protestant	0 (0%)	Sikh	6 (6%)
	Other Christian denomination	4 (4%)	Other	3 (3%)
	Buddhist	5 (5%)		
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?			
	Heterosexual/ Straight			91 (99%)
	Homosexual/Gay			1 (1%)
	Bisexual			0 (0%)
Q1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs.)			
	Yes			11 (12%)
	No			84 (88%)
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?			
	Yes			5 (5%)
	No			89 (95%)
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?			
	Yes			50 (53%)
	No			45 (47%)
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?			
	Yes			55 (57%)
	No			41 (43%)

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			70 (65%)
	2 hours or longer			34 (31%)
	Don't remember			4 (4%)
Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?			
	My journey was less than two hours			70 (65%)
	Yes			22 (21%)
	No			13 (12%)
	Don't remember			2 (2%)
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?			
	My journey was less than two hours			70 (65%)
	Yes			2 (2%)
	No			35 (33%)
	Don't remember			0 (0%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?			
	Yes			56 (52%)
	No			43 (40%)
	Don't remember			9 (8%)

Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	79 (73%)
	No	28 (26%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well	31 (29%)
	Well	37 (35%)
	Neither	27 (25%)
	Badly	9 (8%)
	Very badly	2 (2%)
	Don't remember	1 (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	84 (77%)
	Yes, I received written information	16 (15%)
	No, I was not told anything	11 (10%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	90 (83%)
	No	17 (16%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?			
	Less than 2 hours	74 (67%)		
	2 hours or longer	35 (32%)		
	Don't remember	1 (1%)		
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?			
	Yes	83 (77%)		
	No	19 (18%)		
	Don't remember	6 (6%)		
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?			
	Very well	28 (25%)		
	Well	48 (44%)		
	Neither	27 (25%)		
	Badly	5 (5%)		
	Very badly	2 (2%)		
	Don't remember	0 (0%)		
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	Loss of property	20 (19%)	Physical health	12 (11%)
	Housing problems	11 (10%)	Mental health	5 (5%)
	Contacting employers	3 (3%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	4 (4%)
	Contacting family	22 (20%)	Getting telephone numbers	19 (18%)
	Childcare	3 (3%)	Other	3 (3%)
	Money worries	18 (17%)	Did not have any problems	50 (46%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal	4 (4%)		

Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?	
	Yes	22 (20%)
	No	36 (33%)
	Did not have any problems	50 (46%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Tobacco	32 (30%)
	A shower	30 (28%)
	A free telephone call	35 (33%)
	Something to eat	39 (37%)
	PIN telephone credit	31 (29%)
	Toiletries/ basic items	24 (23%)
	Did not receive anything	30 (28%)
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Chaplain	58 (56%)
	Someone from health services	55 (53%)
	A Listener/Samaritans	36 (35%)
	Prison shop/ canteen	22 (21%)
	Did not have access to any of these	22 (21%)
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	What was going to happen to you	53 (50%)
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal	33 (31%)
	How to make routine requests (applications)	39 (37%)
	Your entitlement to visits	41 (39%)
	Health services	41 (39%)
	Chaplaincy	49 (46%)
	Not offered any information	28 (26%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes	75 (69%)
	No	29 (27%)
	Don't remember	5 (5%)
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	Have not been on an induction course	6 (6%)
	Within the first week	93 (85%)
	More than a week	10 (9%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	Have not been on an induction course	6 (6%)
	Yes	56 (52%)
	No	38 (35%)
	Don't remember	8 (7%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	Did not receive an assessment	4 (12%)
	Within the first week	18 (53%)
	More than a week	12 (35%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to.....					
		Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult N/A
	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	8 (23%)	10 (29%)	5 (14%)	6 (17%)	3 (9%)
	Attend legal visits?	6 (18%)	12 (36%)	7 (21%)	1 (3%)	4 (12%)
						3 (9%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?					
	Not had any letters					8 (23%)
	Yes					10 (29%)
	No					17 (49%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?					
	Yes					16 (46%)
	No					8 (23%)
	Don't know					11 (31%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:					
		Yes	No	Don't know		
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	32 (91%)	3 (9%)	0 (0%)		
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	18 (53%)	15 (44%)	1 (3%)		
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	11 (33%)	21 (64%)	1 (3%)		
	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	16 (48%)	17 (52%)	0 (0%)		
	If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	19 (58%)	9 (27%)	5 (15%)		
Q4.5	What is the food like here?					
	Very good					1 (3%)
	Good					12 (34%)
	Neither					11 (31%)
	Bad					5 (14%)
	Very bad					6 (17%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?					
	Have not bought anything yet/ don't know					2 (2%)
	Yes					43 (41%)
	No					59 (57%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?					
	Yes					40 (39%)
	No					19 (19%)
	Don't know					43 (42%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?					
	Yes					47 (47%)
	No					19 (19%)
	Don't know/ N/A					34 (34%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?					
	Yes					68 (65%)
	No					8 (8%)
	Don't know/ N/A					28 (27%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?					
	I don't want to attend					23 (23%)

Very easy	27 (26%)
Easy	22 (22%)
Neither	1 (1%)
Difficult	6 (6%)
Very difficult	4 (4%)
Don't know	19 (19%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1 Is it easy to make an application?

Yes	83 (84%)
No	11 (11%)
Don't know	5 (5%)

Q5.2 Please answer the following questions about applications (*If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option*).

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are applications dealt with fairly?	9 (9%)	62 (63%)	27 (28%)
Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	9 (9%)	46 (48%)	41 (43%)

Q5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?

Yes	55 (56%)
No	13 (13%)
Don't know	30 (31%)

Q5.4 Please answer the following questions about complaints (*If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option*).

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are complaints dealt with fairly?	55 (56%)	22 (22%)	21 (21%)
Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	55 (59%)	17 (18%)	22 (23%)

Q5.5 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?

Yes	11 (13%)
No	77 (88%)

Q5.6 How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?

Don't know who they are	35 (36%)
Very easy	9 (9%)
Easy	15 (15%)
Neither	27 (28%)
Difficult	7 (7%)
Very difficult	5 (5%)

Section 6: Relationships with staff

Q6.1 Do most staff treat you with respect?

Yes	72 (73%)
No	27 (27%)

Q6.2 Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?

Yes	77 (78%)
No	22 (22%)

Q6.3 Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?

Yes	24 (24%)
No	75 (76%)

Q6.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	11 (11%)
	<i>Never</i>	22 (22%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	19 (19%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	24 (24%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	16 (16%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	7 (7%)
Q6.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	43 (43%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	21 (21%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	28 (28%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (7%)
Q6.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	43 (45%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	17 (18%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	15 (16%)
	<i>Neither</i>	12 (13%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	6 (6%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	3 (3%)

Section 7: Safety

Q7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	31 (31%)
	<i>No</i>	68 (69%)
Q7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	<i>Yes</i>	13 (13%)
	<i>No</i>	85 (87%)
Q7.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	68 (72%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	10 (11%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	10 (11%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>At work</i>	5 (5%)
	<i>During movement</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>At education</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>At meal times</i>	14 (15%)
	<i>At health services</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Visits area</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>In wing showers</i>	8 (8%)
	<i>In gym showers</i>	5 (5%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	5 (5%)
	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	6 (6%)
	<i>In your cell</i>	7 (7%)
	<i>At religious services</i>	1 (1%)
Q7.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	21 (21%)
	<i>No</i>	80 (79%)
Q7.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	9 (9%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	14 (14%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Medication</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	2 (2%)

Your race or ethnic origin	3 (3%)
Your religion/religious beliefs	3 (3%)
Your nationality	1 (1%)
Your from a different part of the country than others	2 (2%)
You are from a traveller community	1 (1%)
Your sexual orientation	2 (2%)
Your age	4 (4%)
You have a disability	1 (1%)
You were new here	6 (6%)
Your offence/ crime	2 (2%)
Gang related issues	1 (1%)

Q7.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes	23 (23%)
No	75 (77%)

Q7.7 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)	5 (5%)
Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)	2 (2%)
Sexual abuse	1 (1%)
Feeling threatened or intimidated	10 (10%)
Medication	1 (1%)
Debt	1 (1%)
Drugs	1 (1%)
Your race or ethnic origin	6 (6%)
Your religion/religious beliefs	3 (3%)
Your nationality	3 (3%)
Your from a different part of the country than others	2 (2%)
You are from a traveller community	1 (1%)
Your sexual orientation	1 (1%)
Your age	3 (3%)
You have a disability	2 (3%)
You were new here	3 (3%)
Your offence/ crime	2 (2%)
Gang related issues	1 (1%)

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

Not been victimised	65 (71%)
Yes	2 (2%)
No	24 (26%)

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

	Don't know	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult
The doctor	6 (6%)	7 (7%)	18 (18%)	20 (20%)	36 (36%)	13 (13%)
The nurse	5 (5%)	22 (23%)	37 (38%)	14 (14%)	16 (16%)	3 (3%)
The dentist	11 (11%)	3 (3%)	9 (9%)	12 (12%)	24 (25%)	38 (39%)

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

	Not been	Very good	Good	Neither	Bad	Very bad
The doctor	15 (15%)	11 (11%)	28 (28%)	19 (19%)	15 (15%)	12 (12%)
The nurse	6 (6%)	20 (21%)	29 (30%)	21 (22%)	14 (14%)	7 (7%)
The dentist	32 (33%)	7 (7%)	12 (13%)	14 (15%)	14 (15%)	17 (18%)

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

Not been	6 (6%)
----------	--------

Very good	12 (12%)
Good	26 (27%)
Neither	23 (23%)
Bad	17 (17%)
Very bad	14 (14%)

Q8.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes	44 (44%)
No	56 (56%)

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

Not taking medication	56 (57%)
Yes, all my meds	34 (34%)
Yes, some of my meds	8 (8%)
No	1 (1%)

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

Yes	8 (8%)
No	92 (92%)

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

Do not have any emotional or mental health problems	92 (93%)
Yes	2 (2%)
No	5 (5%)

Section 9: Drugs and alcohol

Q9.1 Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?

Yes	14 (14%)
No	86 (86%)

Q9.2 Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?

Yes	10 (10%)
No	90 (90%)

Q9.3 Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?

Very easy	33 (34%)
Easy	7 (7%)
Neither	6 (6%)
Difficult	4 (4%)
Very difficult	3 (3%)
Don't know	45 (46%)

Q9.4 Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?

Very easy	20 (20%)
Easy	12 (12%)
Neither	9 (9%)
Difficult	4 (4%)
Very difficult	5 (5%)
Don't know	48 (49%)

Q9.5 Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?

Yes	4 (4%)
No	94 (96%)

Q9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	3 (3%)
	No	94 (97%)
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>	81 (86%)
	Yes	7 (7%)
	No	6 (6%)
Q9.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	90 (92%)
	Yes	5 (5%)
	No	3 (3%)
Q9.9	Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	85 (91%)
	Yes	7 (8%)
	No	1 (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	4 (4%)	32 (30%)	47 (44%)	7 (7%)	5 (5%)	12 (11%)
	Vocational or skills training	9 (9%)	19 (19%)	34 (33%)	11 (11%)	12 (12%)	17 (17%)
	Education (including basic skills)	6 (6%)	30 (31%)	43 (44%)	7 (7%)	5 (5%)	6 (6%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	26 (29%)	10 (11%)	18 (20%)	16 (18%)	11 (12%)	10 (11%)
Q10.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>					18 (19%)	
	Prison job					63 (65%)	
	Vocational or skills training					16 (16%)	
	Education (including basic skills)					18 (19%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes					3 (3%)	
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	6 (7%)	44 (50%)	36 (41%)	2 (2%)		
	Vocational or skills training	12 (16%)	44 (58%)	14 (18%)	6 (8%)		
	Education (including basic skills)	9 (12%)	45 (59%)	17 (22%)	5 (7%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes	15 (23%)	23 (35%)	21 (32%)	7 (11%)		
Q10.4	How often do you usually go to the library?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					11 (11%)	
	<i>Never</i>					21 (21%)	
	<i>Less than once a week</i>					22 (22%)	
	<i>About once a week</i>					22 (22%)	
	<i>More than once a week</i>					23 (23%)	
Q10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?						
	<i>Don't use it</i>					25 (25%)	
	Yes					34 (34%)	
	No					40 (40%)	

Q10.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	17 (17%)
	<i>0</i>	12 (12%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	14 (14%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	29 (29%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	27 (27%)
Q10.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	6 (6%)
	<i>0</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	17 (18%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	23 (24%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	47 (49%)
Q10.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	10 (11%)
	<i>0</i>	6 (6%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	5 (5%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	68 (73%)
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>	2 (2%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	5 (5%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	6 (6%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	14 (15%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	52 (56%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	12 (13%)

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>	59 (60%)
	<i>No</i>	39 (40%)
Q11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	32 (33%)
	<i>No</i>	65 (67%)
Q11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	15 (15%)
	<i>No</i>	83 (85%)
Q11.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	9 (9%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	25 (26%)
	<i>Easy</i>	35 (36%)
	<i>Neither</i>	8 (8%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	10 (10%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	10 (10%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	1 (1%)

Section 12: Preparation for release

Q12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	Yes	88 (90%)
	No	10 (10%)
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>	10 (11%)
	<i>No contact</i>	10 (11%)
	<i>Letter</i>	24 (28%)
	<i>Telephone</i>	45 (52%)
	<i>Visit</i>	32 (37%)
Q12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	49 (52%)
	No	46 (48%)
Q12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	Yes	76 (78%)
	No	21 (22%)
Q12.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	21 (21%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	27 (28%)
	<i>Involved</i>	21 (21%)
	<i>Neither</i>	9 (9%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	7 (7%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	13 (13%)
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>	21 (23%)
	<i>Nobody</i>	32 (34%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	18 (19%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>	24 (26%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	6 (6%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	15 (16%)
Q12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	21 (23%)
	Yes	43 (47%)
	No	14 (15%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	14 (15%)
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>	21 (22%)
	Yes	12 (13%)
	No	54 (57%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	7 (7%)
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>	21 (22%)
	Yes	33 (35%)
	No	24 (25%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	17 (18%)

Q12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?		
	Yes		10 (11%)
	No		51 (54%)
	Don't know		34 (36%)
Q12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?		
	Yes		28 (31%)
	No		63 (69%)
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
	Employment	27 (29%)	34 (37%)
	Accommodation	39 (45%)	19 (22%)
	Benefits	36 (40%)	18 (20%)
	Finances	34 (40%)	14 (16%)
	Education	35 (41%)	23 (27%)
	Drugs and alcohol	43 (51%)	16 (19%)
			No
			32 (34%)
			29 (33%)
			35 (39%)
			38 (44%)
			27 (32%)
			25 (30%)
Q12.13	Have you been provided with information on the following? (please tick all that apply to you.)		
			Yes
	Resettlement day release		64 (66%)
	Resettlement overnight release		58 (64%)
			No
			33 (34%)
			32 (36%)
Q12.14	Have you had access to the following? (please tick all that apply to you.)		
			Yes
	Resettlement day release		65 (68%)
	Resettlement overnight release		58 (64%)
	Special purpose leave		32 (39%)
			No
			31 (32%)
			32 (36%)
			50 (61%)
Q12.15	Please answer the following questions on your preparation for release?		
			Yes
	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here		36 (38%)
	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility, freedom etc.)		31 (34%)
	Do you feel you have been given a greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions		65 (70%)
	Have you been on a preparation for release course		23 (26%)
	Is this prison near your home area or intended release address		65 (70%)
	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that will make you less likely to offend in the future		55 (59%)
			No
			59 (62%)
			61 (66%)
			28 (30%)
			67 (74%)
			28 (30%)
			38 (41%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Hewell Closed 2014

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

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell closed 2014	Local prisons comparator	HMP Hewell closed 2014	HMP Hewell closed 2012
	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		164	5,769	164	182
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	2%	6%	2%	1%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	62%	67%	62%	71%
1.3	Are you on recall?	18%	9%	18%	10%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	17%	20%	17%	26%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	6%	3%	6%	3%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	9%	13%	9%	13%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	97%	97%	97%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	96%	97%	96%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	28%	24%	28%	26%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	6%	5%	6%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	9%	12%	9%	10%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3%	3%	3%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	23%	23%	23%	18%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	7%	5%	7%	7%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	27%	32%	27%	37%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	64%	54%	64%	55%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	22%	20%	22%	23%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	40%	36%	40%	39%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	4%	9%	4%	8%
2.4	Was the van clean?	51%	58%	51%	59%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	70%	74%	70%	73%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	63%	66%	63%	68%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	64%	64%	64%	59%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	5%	3%	5%	7%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Key to tables		HMP Hewell closed 2014	Local prisons comparator	HMP Hewell closed 2014	HMP Hewell closed 2012
	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				
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	73%	80%	73%	82%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	32%	44%	32%	34%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	76%	77%	76%	70%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	59%	62%	59%	58%
When you first arrived:					
3.4	Did you have any problems?	76%	75%	76%	74%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	22%	15%	22%	13%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	18%	21%	18%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	3%	5%	3%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	29%	32%	29%	31%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	3%	3%	3%	3%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	18%	23%	18%	27%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	23%	22%	23%	20%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	21%	17%	21%	18%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	26%	21%	26%	22%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	8%	8%	8%	6%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	32%	31%	32%	32%
For those with problems:					
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	36%	34%	36%	33%
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:					
3.6	Tobacco?	77%	82%	77%	88%
3.6	A shower?	11%	32%	11%	16%
3.6	A free telephone call?	76%	57%	76%	78%
3.6	Something to eat?	66%	73%	66%	67%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	53%	56%	53%	63%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	49%	61%	49%	47%
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?	41%	45%	41%	49%
3.7	Someone from health services?	72%	69%	72%	68%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	45%	33%	45%	55%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	7%	21%	7%	14%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:					
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	34%	45%	34%	43%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	35%	42%	35%	41%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	26%	39%	26%	38%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	28%	40%	28%	38%
3.8	Health services?	40%	48%	40%	47%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell closed 2014	Local prisons comparator	HMP Hewell closed 2014	HMP Hewell closed 2012
	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				
3.8	The chaplaincy?	31%	43%	31%	40%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	73%	73%	73%	76%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	69%	78%	69%	74%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	44%	54%	44%	49%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	68%	74%	68%	70%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	39%	39%	39%	39%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	50%	55%	50%	61%
4.1	Get bail information?	13%	20%	13%	21%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	54%	41%	54%	42%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	38%	36%	38%	46%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	45%	54%	45%	46%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	89%	77%	89%	88%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	73%	75%	73%	73%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	45%	56%	45%	44%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	12%	31%	12%	23%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	59%	63%	59%	70%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	18%	23%	18%	17%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	13%	21%	13%	21%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	46%	47%	46%	50%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	58%	55%	58%	64%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	46%	51%	46%	46%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	54%	51%	54%	61%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	34%	45%	34%	44%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	76%	75%	76%	85%
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	43%	54%	43%	53%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	30%	40%	30%	49%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	54%	50%	54%	48%
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	31%	31%	31%	42%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	24%	29%	24%	40%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	19%	20%	19%	17%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	13%	20%	13%	13%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell closed 2014	Local prisons comparator	HMP Hewell closed 2014	HMP Hewell closed 2012
	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 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	36%	42%	36%	40%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	32%	43%	32%	36%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	6%	8%	6%	6%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	41%	35%	41%	29%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	78%	74%	78%	78%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	73%	71%	73%	73%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	25%	28%	25%	25%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	11%	18%	11%	11%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	26%	41%	26%	45%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	69%	67%	69%	67%
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	48%	41%	48%	39%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	24%	18%	24%	15%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	37%	27%	37%	25%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	20%	11%	20%	11%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	14%	7%	14%	12%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	6%	1%	6%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	22%	14%	22%	13%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	16%	6%	16%	10%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	15%	5%	15%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	12%	3%	12%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	9%	4%	9%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	3%	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	3%	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	3%	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	7%	4%	7%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	1%	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	1%	2%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	2%	4%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	3%	5%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	14%	6%	14%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	6%	5%	6%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	7%	4%	7%	5%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell closed 2014	Local prisons comparator	HMP Hewell closed 2014	HMP Hewell closed 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	33%	30%	33%	31%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	18%	11%	18%	10%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	9%	5%	9%	6%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	5%	1%	5%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	16%	12%	16%	10%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	9%	5%	9%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	2%	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	3%	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	4%	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	3%	3%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	3%	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	3%	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	1%	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	3%	4%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	5%	5%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	5%	4%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	2%	3%	3%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	32%	32%	32%	39%
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	18%	23%	18%	24%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	40%	47%	40%	36%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	5%	9%	5%	5%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	35%	41%	35%	40%
9.2	The nurse?	54%	53%	54%	54%
9.2	The dentist?	21%	31%	21%	26%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	37%	36%	37%	40%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	67%	50%	67%	48%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	48%	61%	48%	53%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	48%	37%	48%	38%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	59%	43%	59%	33%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell closed 2014	Local prisons comparator	HMP Hewell closed 2014	HMP Hewell closed 2012
	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: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	36%	33%	36%	32%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	26%	23%	26%	25%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	38%	32%	38%	35%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	17%	13%	17%	17%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	17%	8%	17%	7%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	13%	8%	13%	9%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	59%	62%	59%	64%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	67%	58%	67%	67%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	85%	75%	85%	91%
SECTION 11: Activities					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1	A prison job?	40%	30%	40%	37%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	32%	29%	32%	28%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	44%	45%	44%	38%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	17%	18%	17%	15%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2	A prison job?	46%	44%	46%	46%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	8%	9%	8%	11%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	20%	26%	20%	19%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	8%	7%	8%	9%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	80%	68%	80%	65%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	43%	40%	43%	47%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	66%	56%	66%	50%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	43%	48%	43%	54%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	73%	67%	73%	53%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	47%	53%	47%	58%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	65%	53%	65%	46%
	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?	38%	44%	38%	53%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	28%	30%	28%	33%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	30%	33%	30%	39%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	24%	27%	24%	21%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	34%	39%	34%	17%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	58%	45%	58%	42%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell closed 2014	Local prisons comparator	HMP Hewell closed 2014	HMP Hewell closed 2012
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					
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	9%	10%	9%	8%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	39%	32%	39%	30%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	54%	48%	54%	41%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	22%	34%	22%	17%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	29%	37%	29%	27%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	59%	61%	59%	50%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	37%	42%	37%	50%
13.2	Contact by letter?	37%	29%	37%	30%
13.2	Contact by phone?	24%	13%	24%	18%
13.2	Contact by visit?	32%	36%	32%	27%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	24%	30%	24%	30%
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	27%	37%	27%	31%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	57%	56%	57%	63%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	48%	45%	48%	43%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	32%	32%	32%	26%
13.6	Offender manager?	44%	26%	44%	26%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	8%	10%	8%	23%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	8%	17%	8%	26%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	46%	56%	46%	65%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	38%	27%	38%	25%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	67%	32%	67%	30%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	9%	7%	9%	6%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	12%	12%	12%	13%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:					
13.12	Employment?	34%	29%	34%	30%
13.12	Accommodation?	35%	36%	35%	43%
13.12	Benefits?	38%	39%	38%	44%
13.12	Finances?	25%	24%	25%	21%
13.12	Education?	33%	29%	33%	26%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	48%	44%	48%	46%
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	49%	48%	49%	43%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity) HMP Hewell (Closed) 2014

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		45	114
1.3	Are you sentenced?	64%	62%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	18%	5%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	96%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	96%	98%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	30%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	7%	29%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	40%	22%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	62%	65%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	58%	66%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	73%	78%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	60%	59%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	79%	74%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	64%	76%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	71%	75%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	73%	67%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	38%	40%

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		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	49%	44%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	86%	92%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	16%	11%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	12%	15%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	33%	51%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	41%	65%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	45%	44%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	53%	53%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	72%	79%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	55%	55%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	26%	39%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	37%	31%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	7%	5%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	67%	82%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	65%	76%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	7%	12%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	26%	24%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	50%	46%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	29%	23%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	31%	39%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	14%	25%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	7%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	3%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	5%	3%

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		
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	5%	4%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	38%	31%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	24%	12%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	7%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	3%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	5%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	3%	4%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	20%	17%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	38%	42%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	55%	72%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	20%	59%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	29%	41%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	37%	50%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	13%	7%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	32%	14%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	5%	9%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	48%	20%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	27%	22%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	39%	34%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	54%	61%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	10%	9%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	51%	56%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	23%	22%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (disability) HMP Hewell (Closed) 2014

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	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		37	124
1.3	Are you sentenced?	65%	62%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	6%	10%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	95%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	97%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	9%	34%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	8%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	3%	11%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	11%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	8%	33%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67%	61%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	70%	62%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	72%	78%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	70%	57%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	89%	71%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	74%	70%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	72%	76%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	68%	71%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	41%	38%

Key to tables

Diversity analysis

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	43%	45%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	80%	92%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	12%	13%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	14%	13%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	47%	46%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	64%	56%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	44%	46%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	53%	55%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	85%	74%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	55%	54%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	35%	36%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	27%	35%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	6%	6%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	74%	79%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	77%	71%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	18%	9%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	20%	27%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	68%	41%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	34%	21%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	56%	31%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	32%	19%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	12%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	9%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	9%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	9%	3%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	18%	1%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	44%	29%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	18%	15%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	6%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	9%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	12%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	9%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	18%	0%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	23%	16%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	47%	38%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	97%	58%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	83%	37%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	41%	37%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	61%	42%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	6%	9%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	3%	24%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	12%	6%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	20%	30%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	14%	27%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	29%	36%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	64%	57%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	9%	9%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	63%	51%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	27%	21%

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Hewell 2014

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

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell 2014	HMP Hewell 2012
	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		110	1784	110	99
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	1%	0%	0%
1.3	Are you on recall?	0%	3%	0%	1%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	4%	6%	4%	10%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	7%	9%	7%	8%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	5%	3%	5%	1%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	100%	98%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	100%	98%	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.)	43%	28%	43%	34%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	4%	3%	2%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	16%	13%	16%	12%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	1%	2%	1%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	12%	11%	12%	9%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	5%	7%	5%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	53%	52%	53%	55%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	58%	53%	58%	54%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	32%	46%	32%	29%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	60%	81%	60%	60%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	6%	10%	6%	19%
2.4	Was the van clean?	52%	68%	52%	65%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	73%	84%	73%	77%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	63%	76%	63%	73%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	77%	80%	77%	75%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	15%	14%	15%	11%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Hewell 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell 2014	HMP Hewell 2012
	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				
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	83%	93%	83%	88%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	67%	66%	67%	69%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	77%	87%	77%	72%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	69%	79%	69%	63%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	54%	42%	54%	52%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	19%	9%	19%	15%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	10%	8%	10%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	3%	3%	3%	1%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	20%	12%	20%	22%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	3%	1%	3%	1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	17%	11%	17%	15%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	4%	5%	4%	7%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	11%	8%	11%	8%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	5%	5%	5%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	4%	1%	4%	0%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	17%	10%	17%	15%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	38%	44%	38%	31%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	30%	60%	30%	44%
3.6	A shower?	28%	43%	28%	25%
3.6	A free telephone call?	33%	46%	33%	53%
3.6	Something to eat?	37%	58%	37%	35%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	29%	54%	29%	47%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	23%	39%	23%	26%
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?	56%	54%	56%	57%
3.7	Someone from health services?	53%	74%	53%	56%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	35%	35%	35%	49%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	21%	26%	21%	15%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	50%	65%	50%	61%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell 2014	HMP Hewell 2012
	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				
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	31%	46%	31%	41%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	37%	58%	37%	53%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	39%	60%	39%	53%
3.8	Health services?	39%	66%	39%	54%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	46%	56%	46%	55%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	69%	91%	69%	77%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	95%	94%	92%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	55%	73%	55%	52%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	89%	86%	89%	82%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	52%	65%	52%	54%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	55%	52%	55%	49%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	29%	27%	29%	32%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	46%	47%	46%	54%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	92%	98%	92%	97%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	53%	79%	53%	76%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	33%	69%	33%	58%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	48%	78%	48%	69%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	58%	45%	58%	44%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	38%	36%	38%	33%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	42%	47%	42%	36%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	39%	60%	39%	49%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	47%	56%	47%	57%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	65%	66%	65%	72%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	48%	54%	48%	43%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	84%	86%	84%	83%
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	70%	75%	70%	60%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	53%	67%	53%	65%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	56%	52%	56%	35%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell 2014	HMP Hewell 2012
	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				
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	51%	42%	51%	35%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	44%	46%	44%	35%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	13%	16%	13%	10%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	24%	37%	24%	20%
SECTION 6: Relationships with staff					
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	73%	75%	73%	82%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	78%	74%	78%	83%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	24%	25%	24%	30%
6.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	23%	16%	23%	15%
6.5	Do you have a personal officer?	56%	68%	56%	78%
	For those with a personal officer:				
6.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	60%	68%	60%	70%
SECTION 7: Safety					
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	31%	17%	31%	22%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	14%	6%	14%	10%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	21%	13%	21%	13%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
7.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	5%	9%	7%
7.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	0%	1%	1%
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	8%	14%	4%
7.5	Taken your canteen/property?	1%	1%	1%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	1%	2%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	1%	2%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	1%	3%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	1%	3%	0%
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?	2%	2%	2%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%	0%	1%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	1%	2%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	1%	4%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	0%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell 2014	HMP Hewell 2012
	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				
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	2%	6%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	2%	2%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	1%	1%	2%
SECTION 7: Safety continued					
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	24%	21%	24%	20%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	5%	8%	5%	6%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	1%	2%	1%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	1%	0%	1%	0%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	10%	10%	9%
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	1%	1%	3%
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	0%	1%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	2%	6%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	2%	3%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	1%	3%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	2%	2%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	0%	1%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	1%	3%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	1%	2%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	4%	3%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	2%	2%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	1%	1%	2%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
7.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	9%	22%	9%	34%
SECTION 8: Health services					
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	25%	54%	25%	37%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	61%	73%	61%	62%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	13%	28%	13%	18%
	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?	46%	69%	46%	33%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell 2014	HMP Hewell 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.2	The nurse?	54%	76%	54%	54%
8.2	The dentist?	30%	55%	30%	39%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	41%	65%	41%	41%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	44%	44%	44%	37%
	For those currently taking medication:				
8.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	97%	98%	97%	100%
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	8%	14%	8%	3%
	For those who have problems:				
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	31%	50%	31%	33%
SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol					
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	14%	10%	14%	8%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	10%	10%	10%	7%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	41%	34%	41%	42%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	33%	22%	33%	36%
9.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	4%	2%	4%	4%
9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	3%	2%	3%	2%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
9.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	54%	75%	54%	59%
9.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	64%	85%	64%	64%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
9.9	Was the support helpful?	87%	90%	87%	50%
SECTION 10: Activities					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
10.1	A prison job?	74%	76%	74%	75%
10.1	Vocational or skills training?	52%	55%	52%	58%
10.1	Education (including basic skills)?	75%	70%	75%	68%
10.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	31%	33%	31%	30%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
10.2	A prison job?	65%	72%	65%	58%
10.2	Vocational or skills training?	17%	18%	17%	24%
10.2	Education (including basic skills)?	19%	24%	19%	33%
10.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	3%	5%	3%	6%
10.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	93%	93%	93%	87%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hewell 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell 2014	HMP Hewell 2012
	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				
	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%	44%	54%	36%
10.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	84%	80%	84%	77%
	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%	62%	69%	65%
10.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	88%	85%	88%	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?	67%	63%	67%	60%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	77%	70%	77%	62%
	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?	45%	46%	45%	28%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	45%	55%	45%	69%
10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	34%	64%	34%	55%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	56%	54%	56%	60%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	73%	75%	73%	56%
10.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	73%	80%	73%	75%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	56%	52%	56%	65%
SECTION 11: Friends and family					
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	60%	53%	60%	67%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	33%	22%	33%	23%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	15%	13%	15%	15%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	61%	38%	61%	60%
SECTION 12: Preparation for release					
12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	90%	93%	90%	75%
	For those who have an offender manager what type of contact have you had:				
12.2	No contact?	13%	15%	13%	20%
12.2	Contact by letter?	31%	40%	31%	52%
12.2	Contact by phone?	58%	58%	58%	41%
12.2	Contact by visit?	42%	41%	42%	39%
12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	52%	81%	52%	40%
12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	78%	73%	78%	65%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
12.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	63%	72%	63%	67%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMP Hewell 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hewell 2014	HMP Hewell 2012
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					
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
12.6	nobody?	45%	31%	45%	49%
12.6	Offender supervisor?	25%	52%	25%	31%
12.6	Offender manager?	33%	39%	33%	26%
12.6	Named/ personal officer?	9%	19%	9%	22%
12.6	Staff from other departments?	21%	21%	21%	24%
For those with a sentence plan:					
12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	61%	76%	61%	70%
12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	17%	13%	17%	9%
12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	45%	47%	45%	35%
12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	11%	7%	11%	7%
12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	31%	31%	31%	23%
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%	53%	52%	53%
12.12	Accommodation?	40%	52%	40%	42%
12.12	Benefits?	34%	51%	34%	34%
12.12	Finances?	27%	43%	27%	30%
12.12	Education?	46%	52%	46%	52%
12.12	Drugs and alcohol?	39%	58%	39%	48%
Have you been provided with information on the following:					
12.13	Resettlement day release?	66%	78%	66%	71%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	64%	76%	64%	69%
Have you had access to the following:					
12.14	Resettlement day release?	68%	67%	68%	57%
12.14	Resettlement overnight release?	64%	60%	64%	47%
12.14	Special purpose leave?	39%	32%	39%	43%
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:					
12.15	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	38%	24%	38%	26%
12.15	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	34%	27%	34%	29%
12.15	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	70%	80%	70%	70%
12.15	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	26%	17%	26%	21%
12.15	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	70%	45%	70%	61%
12.15	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	59%	59%	59%	60%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMP Hewell (Open) 2014

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	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		41	55	15	81
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	7%	4%	7%	4%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	98%	100%	97%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			100%	31%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	5%	0%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	39%	0%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	7%	15%	19%	10%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	7%	7%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	44%	59%	36%	56%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	60%	72%	52%	66%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	73%	76%	82%	74%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	59%	87%	59%	78%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	58%	73%	48%	69%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	66%	49%	82%	51%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	53%	52%	41%	53%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	56%	76%	41%	72%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	95%	98%	86%	99%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	55%	50%	71%	46%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	93%	88%	100%	91%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	50%	27%	71%	30%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	30%	48%	30%	43%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	46%	36%	30%	41%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	38%	54%	45%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	66%	65%	70%	66%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	80%	85%	61%	86%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	66%	49%	61%	53%
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	68%	76%	59%	75%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	69%	80%	54%	79%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	14%	34%	17%	26%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	64%	58%	54%	61%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	42%	28%	39%	32%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	17%	12%	17%	12%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	22%	21%	17%	22%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	20%	14%	8%	16%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	6%	2%	8%	3%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	6%	2%	8%	3%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	3%	0%	0%	2%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	3%	0%	0%	2%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	32%	12%	39%	17%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	11%	10%	8%	10%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	11%	0%	17%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	8%	0%	8%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	6%	2%	8%	2%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	3%	2%	0%	3%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	17%	29%	22%	23%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	56%	60%	41%	61%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	52%	44%	61%	44%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	8%	8%	8%	8%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	43%	37%	39%	38%
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	59%	71%	46%	71%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	36%	5%	22%	17%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	21%	15%	22%	16%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	5%	0%	3%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	54%	37%	41%	44%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	60%	49%	50%	55%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	71%	75%	59%	76%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	69%	82%	67%	78%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	38%	71%	24%	62%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	21%	38%	33%	31%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	18%	12%	24%	14%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:				
12.12	Resettlement day release?	56%	72%	35%	71%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	47%	74%	26%	70%
	Have you had access to the following:				
12.13	Resettlement day release?	68%	72%	45%	72%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	63%	65%	28%	68%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	37%	42%	13%	44%
	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?	40%	43%	20%	44%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	39%	30%	10%	37%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	55%	82%	45%	75%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	43%	17%	45%	24%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	65%	71%	65%	70%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (disability, age - over 50) HMP Hewell (Open) 2014

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		16	94	11	84
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	6%	7%	4%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	97%	93%	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.)	26%	45%	28%	45%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	10%	3%	0%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	26%	15%	0%	19%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			28%	9%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	20%	3%	9%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	45%	54%	50%	53%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	55%	66%	76%	62%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	80%	74%	93%	75%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	80%	74%	83%	76%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	65%	66%	83%	67%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	89%	54%	45%	55%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	31%	54%	74%	50%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	65%	67%	76%	68%

Diversity analysis

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				
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	90%	97%	86%	96%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	56%	52%	64%	49%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	90%	87%	92%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	44%	35%	36%	37%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	35%	42%	52%	39%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	22%	43%	52%	37%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	35%	46%	59%	45%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	55%	65%	74%	64%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	72%	84%	85%	84%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	61%	54%	46%	58%
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	72%	74%	93%	69%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	50%	79%	82%	78%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	22%	25%	41%	20%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	28%	64%	59%	56%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	50%	31%	26%	32%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	22%	13%	7%	15%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	39%	19%	41%	17%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	22%	16%	33%	10%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	11%	3%	7%	3%

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				
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	4%	7%	3%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	7%	0%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	5%	14%	3%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	7%	0%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	28%	20%	26%	23%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	22%	10%	19%	9%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	5%	7%	6%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	4%	7%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	4%	7%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	4%	14%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	11%	2%	7%	1%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	20%	24%	48%	21%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	45%	60%	74%	58%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	78%	42%	67%	40%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	22%	7%	7%	8%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	50%	37%	44%	41%
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	78%	65%	54%	66%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	11%	19%	0%	19%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	22%	18%	22%	18%

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 taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	4%	0%	3%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	72%	41%	50%	45%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	28%	57%	20%	62%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	72%	74%	67%	74%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	61%	79%	76%	73%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	44%	58%	61%	55%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	56%	30%	20%	35%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	24%	15%	8%	16%
Have you been provided with information on the following:					
12.12	Resettlement day release?	44%	68%	80%	64%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	27%	66%	70%	64%
Have you had access to the following:					
12.13	Resettlement day release?	69%	69%	83%	65%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	42%	65%	82%	62%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	15%	43%	55%	37%
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?	13%	46%	54%	35%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	13%	37%	39%	33%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	69%	73%	92%	66%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	24%	27%	24%	26%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	56%	71%	76%	69%