

Report on an unannounced inspection of

# **HMP & YOI Sudbury**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**10–28 April 2017**

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



Crown copyright 2017

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

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

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at the address below or: [hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk](mailto: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	17
Section 2. Respect	27
Section 3. Purposeful activity	39
Section 4. Resettlement	45
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice	53
Section 6. Appendices	57
Appendix I: Inspection team	57
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	59
Appendix III: Prison population profile	67
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	71

### **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/>

# Introduction

At the time of the inspection, HMP Sudbury, an open prison in Derbyshire, held 576 male category D prisoners, including a small number of young adults (aged between 18-21 years). Nearly all men were coming towards the end of either a long determinate or indeterminate sentence. The central task of the prison was to provide men with the conditions and support they needed to prepare them for successful release back into the community. At the last inspection, we considered that the prison was failing badly in this central task, and it was good to see that this had now changed, and there was evidence of positive work to rehabilitate the men held at the prison.

The prison was generally safe with few instances of violence, and a downward trend in the number of prisoners absconding and failing to return from release on temporary licence (ROTL). There was a particularly good focus on ensuring men only returned to closed conditions after more serious transgressions of the rules or after a period of reflection. Arrangements for the small number of men vulnerable to self-harming were good, and security focused on the main challenges, which related to parcels containing drugs being left in the grounds, mobile telephones and other banned items. It was relevant that new psychoactive substances (new drugs that are developed or chosen to mimic the effects of illegal drugs such as cannabis, heroin or amphetamines and may have unpredictable and life threatening effects) had been implicated in some recent deaths in custody, and the prison had a good focus on managing these issues and providing support to men with addictions. We were concerned, however, that not all instances of antisocial behaviour were investigated, and that support for some victims of bullying and those struggling to come to terms with open conditions was not always sufficient.

This lack of support was linked to some staff-prisoner relationships; men in our survey were more negative than the comparator about staff treating them respectfully and having someone who would help them with a problem or instigate regular contact with them. During the inspection prisoners told us this was related to a small, but influential, group of discipline staff. In addition, the personal officer scheme did not always function well. Prison leaders were aware of these issues and were taking proactive steps to address cultural issues among some staff. Nevertheless, the interactions we observed were good and it was evident that the majority of staff supported the rehabilitative ethos of the prison.

Work to support men to develop their educational and employment skills had improved, and a wide range of good opportunities were now provided. Employment Pipelines, which provided a structured pathway to specific employment goals, was an interesting and developing initiative. ROTL was used extensively to support efforts to test prisoners' readiness for release and prepare men for this step. A good range of 'through-the-gate' support was provided to this end. Offender management work had improved considerably since our last inspection and casework was generally good, and levels of contact better than we often see. Public protection work had also improved, although a greater focus on the pre-release phase was still needed. The prison had prioritised supporting men in maintaining contact with their families, and ROTL and innovative family visits were used to this end. Some of this work was made more challenging by the substantial number of men at Sudbury with only short periods of time left to serve, and who as a result could not benefit from all the useful opportunities available.

Overall, Sudbury was well led and had made significant progress since our last inspection. It was now delivering some strong support and doing much more to achieve its main aim of providing rehabilitative opportunities for men held. There remained a small number of important issues for the prison to address, but we left confident that yet further improvement was within the prison's capabilities.

**Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

June 2017



# Fact page

**Task of the establishment**

A category D open resettlement establishment for young adults and adult male prisoners.

**Prison status**

Public

**Region**

East Midlands

**Number held**

565 on 19 April 2017

**Certified normal accommodation**

581

**Operational capacity**

581

**Date of last full inspection**

21 October–1 November 2013

**Brief history**

HMP and YOI Sudbury became a prison in 1948. It was used consistently since then as an open resettlement establishment. It began taking men aged between 18 and 20 in 2015; prior to this all the men were 21 and over.

**Short description of residential units**

The wings were a combination of 14 single units (East and West 1–7), all linked by one central corridor. They consisted of single and double rooms.

There were four newer single-storey buildings (P1–4) and a two-storey unit (P5-6).

The units were mostly generic, but West 5 housed the first night and induction centre. The prison also had a separate segregation unit.

**Name of governor/director**

Adrian Turner

**Escort contractor**

GEOAmey

**Health service provider**

Care UK Clinical Services Limited

**Learning and skills providers**

Milton Keynes College

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Dorothy Davis

**Community rehabilitation company (CRC)**

Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire and Rutland CRC





# About this inspection and report

A1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, secure training centres, immigration detention facilities, police and court custody and military detention.

A2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

A3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of prisoners, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. The tests are:

<b>Safety</b>	prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely
<b>Respect</b>	prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity
<b>Purposeful activity</b>	prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them
<b>Resettlement</b>	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 HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS).

- **outcomes for prisoners are good.**  
There is no evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in any significant areas.
- **outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good.**  
There is evidence of adverse outcomes for prisoners in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.
- **outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good.**  
There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of prisoners. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.
- **outcomes for prisoners are poor.**  
There is evidence that the outcomes for prisoners are seriously affected by current practice. There is a failure to ensure even adequate treatment of and/or conditions for prisoners. Immediate remedial action is required.

- A5 Our assessments might result in one of the following:
- **recommendations:** will require significant change and/or new or redirected resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be reviewed for implementation at future inspections
  - **examples of good practice:** impressive practice that not only meets or exceeds our expectations, but could be followed by other similar establishments to achieve positive outcomes for prisoners.
- A6 Five key sources of evidence are used by inspectors: observation; prisoner surveys; discussions with prisoners; discussions with staff and relevant third parties; and documentation. During inspections we use a mixed-method approach to data gathering and analysis, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Evidence from different sources is triangulated to strengthen the validity of our assessments.
- A7 Since April 2013, all our inspections have been unannounced, other than in exceptional circumstances. This replaces the previous system of announced and unannounced full main inspections with full or short follow-ups to review progress. All our inspections now follow up recommendations from the last full inspection.
- A8 All inspections of prisons are conducted jointly with Ofsted or Estyn (Wales), the Care Quality Commission, the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) and HM Inspectorate of Probation. This joint work ensures expert knowledge is deployed in inspections and avoids multiple inspection visits.

## This report

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

---

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

# Summary

## Safety

- S1** *Few men were given accurate information about what to expect when they arrived at Sudbury, but support during their early days at the prison was generally good. The level of violence was low and most men felt safe, although more needed to be done to address bullying and provide victims with support. Care for the small number of men vulnerable to self-harm was good. Formal safeguarding arrangements needed further development. Security focused on the challenges faced, particularly drugs and mobile phones. Disciplinary processes were used appropriately to manage more serious poor behaviour and decisions to move men back to closed conditions were considered. Arrangements for men with substance misuse issues were good. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2** *At the last inspection in 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Sudbury were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 13 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved and three had not been achieved.*
- S3** Many prisoners were only told they were going to Sudbury on the morning of their transfer, and few had accurate information about the prison. There had been some improvements in reception processes. Reception and induction orderlies offered some good support, although their roles needed to be better defined, and supervision required improvement. First night and other confidential interviews were now all carried out in private, although interviews covering safety could have been developed further.
- S4** Conditions in the first night wing were not good enough. The induction programme and the availability of induction and prisoner information desk workers meant new prisoners had sufficient support to meet their practical needs.
- S5** Prisoners told us they felt safe and levels of violence were low. Attendance at safer custody meetings needed to improve, as did the analysis of management information, although there had been some useful consultation with prisoners. Most incidents were thoroughly investigated but the management of and support for perpetrators and victims needed to be better. The balance between violence reduction work and rehabilitation was generally good, but more needed to be done to offset the risks arising as a result of the prison's open conditions, which meant bullying could be hard to identify.
- S6** There had been five deaths in custody since the last inspection. None were considered suicide, although the use of new psychoactive substances (new drugs that are developed or chosen to mimic the effects of illegal drugs such as cannabis, heroin or amphetamines and may have unpredictable and life threatening effects) was thought to have been a factor in some cases. Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations were generally implemented well. The incidence of self-harm was low and few prisoners required support through the assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management process for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm. ACCT documents were generally good and detailed observations showed better support for prisoners than expected. Although the prison's formal adult safeguarding processes were underdeveloped, staff we spoke to were familiar with how they should deal with any concerns.

- S7 Security arrangements remained largely proportionate, but some men were being routinely strip-searched following visits and on transfer to courts, which was excessive. The availability of drugs and mobile phones was the major security challenge. The prison had taken proactive steps to combat these problems, including installing more CCTV cameras and consulting prisoners. The flow of intelligence into the security department was good. Links with the local police were good and had led to successful prosecutions. Not all target searching was conducted and suspicion testing often did not take place on time. The incentives and earned privileges policy was generally managed well. Decisions regarding downgrading a prisoner were based on the individual.
- S8 The number of adjudications was high but charges were largely appropriate and hearings conducted fairly. Adjudicators took mitigating circumstances into account and generally awarded proportionate punishments. There was a good focus on ensuring men who broke the rules did not return to closed conditions unless it was necessary. Almost all use of force incidents involved applying handcuffs to move men around the site, usually to the segregation unit.
- S9 The segregation unit was used frequently – in 132 instances in the previous six months. The unit was mainly used as a holding area while decisions were made about removals to closed conditions, and it was encouraging that many men subsequently returned to the normal prison location. Conditions in the unit were reasonable, but there was no exercise yard. Paperwork sometimes lacked detail and failed sufficiently to record the justification for segregation.
- S10 There was an effective strategic approach to substance misuse. The range of psychosocial interventions had increased and services were generally good. The demand for clinical substance misuse services was low and treatment was generally good.

## Respect

**S11** *Sudbury provided men with opportunities to have some control over their lives, which could contribute to their rehabilitation. Outside areas were pleasant and rooms were reasonable, but some residential areas were shabby. We observed generally respectful interactions, but many men complained about a lack of support. More monitoring and consultation was needed so that the concerns of some with protected characteristics could be understood. Faith provision was good. Complaints were well managed. Legal services support was reasonable. Health care was generally good overall. Catering was reasonable and canteen provision good. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

**S12** *At the last inspection in 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Sudbury were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 36 recommendations in the area of respect. At this follow-up inspection we found that 14 of the recommendations had been achieved, 12 had been partially achieved, nine had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

**S13** The prison enabled men to become more independent, develop decision-making skills and live pro-socially (in a socially beneficial way) alongside others, which supported rehabilitation. Outside areas were very attractive. Rooms were reasonably good. In contrast, the main corridor was in poor condition and had peeling paint and an uneven floor. Despite efforts to clean them, toilets and showers were also in a poor state; they had broken tiles, mould and rusty pipework.

- S14 In our survey, fewer men than in comparator prisons said that most staff treated them with respect and many prisoners complained about a small, but influential, group of discipline staff whose behaviour and attitudes were problematic. Too few men felt staff supported them, although we observed generally respectful interactions between staff and prisoners, particularly in the more specialist areas of work. Consultation arrangements were well established, but more needed to be done to ensure staff understood the views of men who engaged less in the life of the prison.
- S15 Equality work was developing but was under-resourced. The equality action team met regularly but ensuring staff and prisoner representatives attended the meeting consistently was a challenge. Managers needed to monitor outcomes for different groups more systematically. Discrimination incident reporting forms were investigated thoroughly. In our survey, black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners were more negative about victimisation by staff, which needed to be explored. Support for men with disabilities was generally appropriate, but peer supporters required more oversight. Consultation with older prisoners was generally effective but less so for groups with protected characteristics.
- S16 It was positive that in our survey, more than at our last inspection and compared with similar prisons said their religious beliefs were respected. The chapel and multi-faith room were accessible, welcoming and peaceful. Provision for all faiths was good, as was pastoral support and men spoke highly of the chaplaincy.
- S17 Responses to complaints were generally timely. Those we saw were polite and most were thorough. Monitoring was effective and had led to changes in practice. Prisoners in our survey were negative about access to their solicitors but most aspects of legal support were appropriate.
- S18 In our survey, prisoners were generally negative about access to and the quality of health services. Chronic staffing problems were being resolved and we considered that overall health services were reasonably good. Clinical governance had improved. The range of primary care services was appropriate, although waiting times for some primary care clinics, including evening GP clinics, were too long. The governance of medication management had improved and was mostly satisfactory. There were now more dental sessions than previously and care was good, but waiting times for routine appointments remained too long. Care for men with mental health problems was good overall, but the range of services offered needed further development. Support for prisoners with complex and social care needs was very good.
- S19 More prisoners than at the last inspection said the food was good or very good. Meals were now pre-selected, which had dealt with concerns about bullying in food queues. Arrangements for men working on release on temporary licence (ROTL) were now good. It was disappointing that there were still no self-catering facilities, although there were plans to introduce them.
- S20 The prison had significantly extended the range of products available in its shop and in our survey, 75% of prisoners said it sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs.

## Purposeful activity

**S21** *Time out of cell and the range of extra-curricular activities offered was very good. Ofsted considered learning, skills and work activities to have improved since the last inspection, and rated them good overall. Partnership working was strong; it enhanced the provision within the prison and externally and there were good opportunities for ROTL. The approach to career progression was promising, but needed to be embedded. Teaching and learning was generally good. Achievements were high in most areas, but needed to be better in English and maths. The library was excellent and the gym reasonable overall. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

**S22** *At the last inspection in 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Sudbury were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made eight recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that four of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and two had not been achieved.*

**S23** Time out of cell was excellent and prisoners were provided with a good degree of freedom to move around the site. Men had free access to a good range of recreational opportunities.

**S24** The prison had successfully developed the provision so it addressed most prisoners' career aspirations in support of resettlement and there were very good opportunities for men to work outside the prison. Milton Keynes College and the prison had implemented productive working partnerships that had raised standards. Leaders and managers used a thorough self-assessment to drive improvements across the provision. The focus on career progression routes, through the Pipelines initiative, was positive but needed to be developed further. Not all prisoners or staff we spoke to had an adequate understanding of the pathways available.

**S25** The prison offered enough purposeful activity places to occupy all the prison population. Part-time work and education was available to meet prisoners' needs. Pay rates did not discourage prisoners from participating in activities. Allocations were fair and equitable. Education and accredited training was more limited for men with short periods left to serve.

**S26** Taught sessions in education and vocational training workshops were generally good. The Secret Diner restaurant offered a very good commercial training environment. In education classes, learners benefited from good learning plans, which tutors used well to provide them with support, particularly in English and maths. Tutors used additional learning support and peer mentors were used well to assist learners, but not enough trained peer mentors were available. In production workshops and gardens, the employment skills prisoners developed were not recognised or recorded. Prisoners were not always fully occupied in the carpentry or textile workshops.

**S27** Learners generally behaved well and had a positive attitude to learning. There was a calm working environment in all areas, which supported men's development. Prisoners with construction trade backgrounds worked on prison projects to further their practice and reinforce their skills. Vocational skills development was generally good and particularly strong in the Secret Diner restaurant and the railway track maintenance course. Attendance and punctuality were generally good.

**S28** Achievements of accredited qualifications on most courses was high and retention rates were generally good. English and maths functional skills achievements in the previous academic year at levels 1 and 2 were very low and retention was poor. In the year so far, learners' achievements and retention showed encouraging levels of improvement.

- S29 The library was excellent. It was well used, stocked and managed. Library staff had developed the provision, which had led to increases in the number of visits and loans. Prisoners had good access to well-managed physical education (PE) facilities. PE staff worked effectively with the health care department and appropriately promoted the benefits gained from adopting healthy lifestyles. A very limited range of low-level accredited courses was offered and the use of ROTL for PE activities was similarly limited.

## Resettlement

**S30** *The strategic approach to resettlement had improved, and there was an appropriate focus on rehabilitation. A significant proportion of the men sent to the prison had insufficient time left to take advantage of the full benefits on offer. Offender management arrangements had improved considerably. ROTL was reasonably well managed. Public protection arrangements had improved, but more focus on the pre-release phase was needed. Resettlement services were reasonably well developed. Some aspects of the children and families work were particularly effective. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

**S31** *At the last inspection in 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Sudbury were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 18 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that 13 of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and two had not been achieved.*

**S32** Strategic management of resettlement had improved significantly since our last inspection. It included a good needs analysis, which informed a detailed action plan. A significant number of prisoners arrived at the prison with only a few weeks left to serve. This placed additional pressure on many services, including offender management, resettlement and the community rehabilitation company (CRC) provision. The reducing reoffending committee was reasonably well attended and links between the offender management unit (OMU), CRC and resettlement team had developed reasonably well. ROTL continued to be used constructively for a significant proportion of prisoners.

**S33** Nearly all prisoners were serving long sentences, just under half were assessed as posing a high risk of harm. Too many prisoners arrived at Sudbury without an up-to-date offender assessment system (OASys) document or sentence plan to inform their move to open conditions. Once at Sudbury most had a review of their OASys and sentence plan but in a few cases, including some high risk of harm prisoners, it was overdue. In our survey, more prisoners than last time said their offender supervisor was helping them achieve their targets. The effectiveness of offender management work had improved and contact was frequent and meaningful. Decisions to release prisoners on home detention curfew (HDC) could be justified and all recent applications had been approved.

**S34** Initial public protection checks and the use of contact restrictions were satisfactory. Oversight by the inter-departmental risk management team (IRMT) had improved but cases due for release were not discussed. We were concerned that some prisoners did not have their multi-agency public protection arrangement (MAPPA) management levels reviewed prior to ROTL or well enough ahead of their final release. The quality of ROTL risk assessments was reasonably good but men needed to be more involved in risk management planning prior to their first release on licence. Categorisation arrangements were appropriate. The specific needs of indeterminate sentence prisoners in open conditions had still not been identified, but casework for this group was appropriate.

- S35 Pre-release resettlement support was appropriately focused on providing advice and guidance so prisoners could be directed to sources of help. However, more in-depth work was being done in some cases, including providing access to a specialist housing adviser. Peer workers checked the immediate resettlement needs of new arrivals and referrals were made as needed. Most prisoners received a review of their resettlement plan prior to release and further support was offered when necessary. More needed to be done to ensure prisoners knew whom to turn to for help across the resettlement pathways.
- S36 CRC staff helped prisoners look for their own accommodation and none had been released homeless in the previous year. Self-reported data indicated some encouraging outcomes, with a recent snapshot indicating that at least 25% went into full-time employment, 19% into self-employment, and 9% into part-time work. Arrangements to ensure continuity of health care prior to release or transfer were appropriate for those with physical, mental health and substance misuse needs.
- S37 Demand for help with money problems was high and prisoners could access a range of help and support. They could open bank accounts and a good number of applications had been processed in the previous year.
- S38 Visitors' waiting facilities were inadequate, but visitors were searched appropriately and it was good that families could hand in property for prisoners. The visits hall was attractive and welcoming, visits were relaxed and staff were friendly. Parenting and relationship courses were good. Family visits were excellent and prisoners' involvement in organising them was good.
- S39 The prison struggled to deliver enough offending behaviour work to meet prisoners' needs, but the enhanced behavioural management scheme provided additional support for a very small number of more complex cases.

## Main concerns and recommendations

- S40 Concern: Men in our survey were more negative than the comparator about most staff treating them with respect, and providing them with support. During the inspection, they told us about a small, but influential group, of discipline staff who were unhelpful and undermined the rehabilitative ethos of the prison.

**Recommendation: The prison should ensure that staff provide prisoners with appropriate and regular support to help them adjust to open conditions and work towards their resettlement back in the community.**

- S41 Concern: A significant number of men were moved to Sudbury after serving long determinate sentences, but with too little time left to benefit from the full range of opportunities available, particularly ROTL. This meant some of the prison's valuable resources were wasted and some men became negative or disruptive, adding to management challenges and potentially affecting the predominantly rehabilitative ethos of the prison.

**Recommendation: Men being transferred to open conditions should have enough time left to serve in custody to enable them to benefit from ROTL.**



# Section 1. Safety

## Courts, escorts and transfers

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.1 Only 62% of prisoners in our survey said the escort van they had travelled in to the prison was clean. The van we inspected was reasonably clean but graffiti was etched on to the windows.
- I.2 In our survey, 27% of prisoners said they had travelled more than two hours to the prison, lower than in similar prisons and compared with the previous inspection. Reception was now open at lunchtime and prisoners were taken off vans promptly and no longer waited for staff to return from lunch. Nonetheless, cells in the vans were cramped and unsuitable for the minority of prisoners who were confined for longer periods.
- I.3 Few new arrivals had received accurate information about the prison and we were told that prisoners were often only told about their move on the morning of their transfer.
- I.4 Most prisoners were not handcuffed during their transfer to open conditions. However, all those going to court were strip-searched, without any risk assessment, which was disproportionate for an open prison. (See recommendation I.37.)

## 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 The prison had an average of 18 new receptions a week. The reception was bright and airy and there were plans to improve it further.
- I.6 In our survey, 77% of prisoners said staff treated them well or very well in reception, which although better than at our last inspection, was lower than the comparator (84%). We spoke to several prisoners who were unhappy because they had been transferred to Sudbury without notice and with little time left on their sentence, which might have contributed to the poor survey results. Interactions we observed with reception staff were polite, friendly and generally supportive. Unlike at our previous inspection, all confidential matters were dealt with in private, including a first night interview. Prisoners and prison orderlies we spoke to were positive about reception staff.
- I.7 Reception and induction orderlies provided some good support, although their roles needed to be better defined and their work was not supervised well enough. The orientation briefing they gave to new prisoners generally reassured them and provided them with information about life in open conditions.
- I.8 The written material prisoners received at reception and in the first night wing was adequate. Information was not translated for the very small number of prisoners who did not

speak English and reception staff we spoke to could not recall using telephone interpretation services. Staff told us that on a few occasions other prisoners had been used to provide interpretation during confidential interviews, which was inappropriate.

- I.9 Although 8% of prisoners in our survey said they felt depressed or suicidal when they first arrived, staff we spoke to said they rarely encountered such problems. Although staff were reassuring, processes could have been developed to ensure any safety concerns and prisoner well-being issues were investigated further. There was a good focus on safer custody issues throughout the reception process and prisoners were repeatedly warned about the risks of getting into debt and the bullying that could result.
- I.10 Conditions in the first night wing needed improvement. There were no kettles and the boiler for making hot drinks was not working. The showers we tested were cold. Staff did not carry out any additional first night checks on new prisoners. Prisoners had no access to Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) in reception or in the induction wing during the working day.
- I.11 All prisoners were offered reception packs (containing items such as biscuits, sweets and orange juice) and a phone call on the first night.
- I.12 There was a two-day induction programme and the availability of induction staff and the prisoner information desk worker (see paragraph 2.4) meant that prisoners had sufficient support to meet their practical early days' needs. Formal meetings were built into the programme and all prisoners saw an offender supervisor within 10 days. Unlike at our last inspection, prisoners' resettlement needs were assessed during induction. Most prisoners we spoke to said they found out what they needed to know from induction and from other prisoners, including peer workers whom they found very helpful, but arrangements for prisoners with little English were inadequate.

## Recommendations

- I.13 **Prisoners who are not fluent in English should receive an appropriate induction. Professional interpretation should be used for all confidential interactions with these prisoners.**
- I.14 **Processes should be developed to ensure the well-being of new prisoners is properly assessed and their safety on their first night assured.**

## 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.15 Most prisoners told us they felt safe. In our main survey, prisoners responded similarly to those in comparator prisons on almost all questions concerning safety and victimisation. The level of violence was low. There had been eight assaults in the previous six months, two on staff and six on prisoners. However, it was a concern that more black and minority ethnic and Muslim men than white men said they had been victimised by staff and more needed to be done to understand the reasons for these results (see paragraphs 2.19 and 2.22).

- I.16** In the previous six months, 60 incidents that involved suspected bullying or other antisocial behaviour had been referred to the safer custody team. Many matters arose from problems associated with debt.
- I.17** Reported incidents of violence, intimidation or bullying were investigated by safer custody staff. Most incidents we looked at had been investigated thoroughly. In most cases where an allegation of assault was proven, the perpetrator was transferred to closed conditions. Otherwise, formal interventions were largely limited to the use of the adjudication process, the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme and room moves. We were concerned to find that some incidents we identified had not been referred to the safer custody team for investigation and we were not satisfied that all other incidents were dealt with promptly. There was little evidence to show that perpetrators and victims were monitored or received any follow up to ensure issues were addressed. (See recommendation I.21.)
- I.18** It was broadly positive that the prison did not take a risk-averse approach to managing prisoners whose well-being might have been a concern in an open prison, where staff supervision levels were much lower than in a closed prison. Although the balance between violence reduction and rehabilitation was generally good, more needed to be done to offset the risks arising as a result of the prison's open status, which meant bullying could be hard to identify.
- I.19** The violence reduction strategy was underdeveloped and did not clearly delineate roles and responsibilities. A brief violence reduction guide gave staff more information, but did little to describe wing staff's role in managing poor behaviour beyond reporting it to the safer custody team.
- I.20** A monthly safer custody meeting took place. Some participants' attendance was inconsistent. There was insufficient analysis of patterns and trends in bullying, although some improvements were planned. Some useful strategic initiatives outside the meeting included consultation with prisoners on violence reduction and bullying.

## Recommendation

- I.21 Safer custody processes should ensure incidents of bullying and low-level antisocial behaviour are investigated and men who are struggling to cope in open conditions identified. Action should be taken against perpetrators, and support provided to victims of bullying.**

## 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.22** There had been five deaths in custody since the last inspection. None were treated as suicide, but the use of new psychoactive substances (NPS) (new drugs that are developed or chosen to mimic the effects of illegal drugs such as cannabis, heroin or amphetamines and may have unpredictable and life threatening effects) was thought to have been a factor in some of them. Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO) recommendations were generally implemented well.

- I.23** Levels of self-harm were low – there had been three incidents in the previous six months. Over the same period, 12 assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm had been opened. Most outlined staff's concerns about the prisoner's mood or behaviour, rather than an actual intention to self-harm or commit suicide. No prisoner was on an ACCT at the time of the inspection.
- I.24** Not all staff had received recent ACCT awareness refresher training. However, the standard of ACCT documentation in our sample was generally good. Most reviews were multidisciplinary, observations were more detailed than expected and there was evidence of some good supportive interactions with prisoners. However, triggers for self-harm were poorly understood and identified. Quality assurance for ACCT documentation was appropriate and deficiencies were being addressed.
- I.25** Staff did not carry anti-ligature knives and those we spoke to were unsure about where they could obtain them. Not all night staff had been trained in first aid procedures. However, night orderly officers, who were always on duty, were trained.
- I.26** Demand for Listener services was low. However, only 42% of prisoners said they could speak to a Listener at any time if they wanted to, compared with 63% elsewhere. Listeners were poorly supervised, although steps were in hand to address this. Listeners were not available during the working day or at night.

## Recommendations

- I.27 All discipline staff should have immediate access to anti-ligature knives.**
- I.28 Listeners should be available at night and throughout the working day.**

## 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.<sup>2</sup>**

- I.29** Safeguarding procedures were still underdeveloped. However, the prison had now established contact with social services and staff we spoke to were familiar with how they should raise concerns. The safer custody meeting discussed prisoners with complex needs, but some key staff, such as those from the health care or substance misuse teams, did not attend regularly. We saw some good examples of the prison supporting vulnerable prisoners, when a more risk-averse approach would have been to transfer them back to closed conditions.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.30** Physical security restrictions were minimal and did not impact on prison life. Procedural security arrangements remained largely proportionate. However, not all strip-searching was intelligence-led. For example, officers strip-searched 5% of all prisoners following a visit and all prisoners transferring to court.
- I.31** The availability of mobile phones and drugs was the main security challenge. The security department had taken steps to remove these threats, such as through the installation of CCTV cameras and consultation with prisoners.
- I.32** Attendance at the monthly security meetings was good. Violence reduction and safer custody were standing agenda items. Attendees analysed a wide range of good quality data and set appropriate action.
- I.33** Dynamic security was good. In the previous six months, staff had submitted a good number of intelligence reports, some of which were based on information from prisoners. The security department collated and analysed the information promptly and outlined appropriate action. However, much of it was not taken. For example, in the previous six months the security department had asked for 124 specific cells to be searched, yet around half were not searched. Many searches that did take place led to banned items being found, which demonstrated that the intelligence was good.
- I.34** The security department took a mature approach to managing risks. Security staff worked closely with the offender management unit to assess prisoners' absconding risks. Not all breaches of prison rules automatically led to a return to closed conditions. The number of absconds had decreased since the previous inspection: there had been 33 in 2013–2014 and 17 in 2016–17. Links with Derbyshire Constabulary were good. A prison intelligence officer from the police worked with the security department. In 2017, the police service had prosecuted seven prisoners for a variety of offences, four of which led to convictions.
- I.35** In our survey, 40% of prisoners said it was easy to get illegal drugs in the prison. In the previous six months about 6% of prisoners tested positive in random mandatory drug testing (MDT), not including those who tested positive for NPS. The most popular drug was cannabis, followed by buprenorphine. NPS remained a problem and 39 prisoners had tested positive since September 2016. NPS had been linked to some recent deaths in custody (see paragraph I.22). Oral and injected anabolic steroids were also a problem. Gym and substance misuse staff ran a steroid awareness group, which prisoners who used the weights room more than twice a week were required to attend. Prisoners who injected steroids could dispose of their needles in sharps bins located around the prison.
- I.36** The MDT team tested prisoners five days a week and completed all the required random, reception and risk tests. However, in 2017, 82% of prisoners who were suspected of taking drugs were not tested within the required timeframes. The facilities used for drug testing were appropriate. Prisoners found to be taking drugs were generally referred to the substance misuse team. The comprehensive supply reduction action plan incorporated other forms of contraband and supported a whole prison approach.

## Recommendations

- I.37 Prisoners should only be strip-searched on the basis of intelligence or a specific suspicion. Authorisation should be recorded, along with an outline of the reasons for the search.**
- I.38 Intelligence-led drug tests and room searches should be completed promptly and within the required timeframes.**

## Incentives and earned privileges

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.39** The IEP policy outlined clearly how the system should work, but it did not apply to an open prison setting. During the inspection 84% of the population were on the enhanced level, 15% on the standard regime and less than 1% on the basic level. The basic level had been introduced in response to prisoner consultation. In reality, the regime had, in most cases, few sanctions attached to it, compared with most closed prisons. However, the primary sanction was to have release on temporary licence (ROTL) withdrawn for 28 days, which was significant. Rather than taking a rigid 'zero-tolerance' approach to poor behaviour, the prison adopted a more flexible position. For example, where a prisoner's previous behaviour had been very good (as in all these cases), staff attempted to give men a second chance if they broke some rules. We considered the approach adopted to have been managed consistently, and it was a positive way forward.
- I.40** The prison was in the process of renewing the IEP policy to better reflect the specific needs and experiences of Sudbury as an open prison.

## Discipline

### Expected outcomes:

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

### Disciplinary procedures

- I.41** The number of adjudications was high – 541 in the previous six months, which was more than over a similar period before our last inspection (311). However, charges were largely appropriate. The hearings we observed and the paperwork we reviewed showed that adjudication processes were fair. Prisoners were given time to state their case and outline any mitigating circumstances. Adjudicators were conscious of the adverse impact of punishments on prisoners' sentence progression. Punishments were generally proportionate and we found cases where prisoners were given cautions and suspended sentences. Appropriate cases were referred to the police and the independent adjudicator.
- I.42** Serious infringements of the rules resulted in the prisoner being swiftly returned to closed conditions. However, minor infringements did not automatically lead to a return to closed

conditions. Where there was a pattern of poor behaviour or a security threat, the heads of the offender management unit and the security department reviewed the prisoner's suitability for open conditions. Suitability reviews were largely fair but sometimes the reasons for returning the prisoner were not clearly recorded.

- I.43** Managers held adjudications standardisation meetings once every two months but did not scrutinise data in depth. The meeting did not monitor the types of charges or compare different adjudicators' outcomes. There was little analysis of data by protected characteristic.

## Recommendation

- I.44** **Adjudication data should be monitored routinely and cover all protected characteristics to ensure emerging trends are identified and acted on if necessary.**

## The use of force

- I.45** In the previous six months, there were 67 recorded incidents involving force. This figure was higher than we would have expected and more than at our last inspection. Almost all incidents involved using handcuffs to move a prisoner to the segregation unit.
- I.46** Use of force paperwork was completed to a reasonable standard and outlined the justification for the use of force. However, too much of it was not completed within the specified timeframe and managers often had to chase officers for it. Officers did not routinely carry batons and there was no special accommodation to manage refractory prisoners. A use of force committee met quarterly to learn lessons and analyse trends.

## Segregation

- I.47** The segregation unit was used frequently – on 132 occasions in the previous six months, which was similar to our last inspection. The unit was often used to hold men while managers decided whether to return them to closed conditions. We were encouraged that many men returned to the normal prison at Sudbury following time in the unit.
- I.48** Conditions in the unit had improved since our last inspection and were reasonable. The unit's two cells were austere, but generally clean and well decorated. Toilets in the cells were partially screened and had lids and seats. Both cells had televisions. As per the prison's smoking policy, segregated prisoners were not allowed to smoke in the unit, but smokers received one e-cigarette a day. There was no exercise yard, which was an issue for the few men who stayed there for longer than a couple of hours.
- I.49** Segregation paperwork sometimes lacked detail and did not always sufficiently justify segregation. The segregation monitoring and review group met quarterly but did not scrutinise in depth how the unit was used. The group did not analyse the reasons for the men's segregation or how long they were held there. Managers could not easily provide us with accurate data on the unit's use.
- I.50** The adjudications holding room was in the segregation unit. It had on occasion been used to segregate a third prisoner when the other two cells were full, which was inappropriate.

## Recommendations

- I.51 Prisoners segregated for longer periods should be offered daily exercise in the open air.**
- I.52 Segregation paperwork should be completed accurately and in full. It should justify in detail why segregation is necessary.**
- I.53 Managers should record and analyse data on the use of the segregation unit, including the reasons why men are segregated and how long they are held there.**

## 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.54** The strategic approach to the illicit use of drugs and alcohol was effective. It included a well-attended committee and an up-to-date drug strategy informed by an annual needs analysis. The supply reduction, demand reduction and treatment strands were well integrated.
- I.55** South Staffordshire and Shropshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust provided psychosocial substance misuse services that were well integrated with the prison. The provision was swiftly adapted to cater for emerging needs, for example, a cannabis group for young adults had been introduced.
- I.56** A practitioner and peer supporter provided an awareness session to all new arrivals, covering areas such as harm reduction relating to synthetic cannabis and steroids. Any prisoner who did not attend the group session was seen individually by the peer supporter, which was good. In our survey, 95% of those who reported a drug problem and all of those who reported an alcohol problem said they were receiving help, which was commendable.
- I.57** The substance misuse team received around 40 referrals a month and was supporting 79 prisoners during the inspection through a combination of drop-in, individual and group interventions. Waiting times were short. The specialist alcohol provision had ended in March 2017, but the team provided support for all addictions, including alcohol and gambling. Relapse prevention awareness was consistently the most required intervention and 75 prisoners had completed the comprehensive four-day enhanced Problem Addictions Choices and Change course since May 2016. More groups were being developed.
- I.58** Prisoners could attend in-house weekly Alcoholics Anonymous meetings or equivalent community support during release on temporary licence. The service was addressing difficulties recruiting and retaining peer supporters, for example, by enabling them to gain a qualification to increase future employment opportunities.
- I.59** Substance misuse practitioners had good access to training and supervision. Regular audits of case files were conducted by the service manager and those we reviewed were generally good.
- I.60** The demand for clinical substance misuse services was low. There was no clinical treatment policy, but one was being developed. During the inspection, four prisoners were receiving opiate substitution treatment, all were on reducing doses and most were positive about the support they received. Prescribing was generally flexible and the psychosocial team attended all prescribing reviews.



## Good practice

- 1.61** *The provision of drug and alcohol harm reduction information to all new arrivals had raised prisoners' awareness of the dangers associated with substance misuse.*



## Section 2. Respect

### Residential units

#### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 The prison provided men with the opportunity to become more independent, develop their decision-making skills and live pro-socially (in a socially beneficial way) alongside others, which supported rehabilitation.
- 2.2 Outside areas were well maintained. Prisoners could enjoy green spaces and attractive gardens. There were 394 rooms spread across 20 residential units. About half of the rooms held two men and the other half were single occupancy. The condition of most rooms was reasonably good. Many were clean and in good order but some on East 1 suffered from damp. Rooms had sufficient storage space and curtains. Very few prisoners had padlocks for the small metal boxes in their rooms used to store valuables. However, they had keys to their rooms and reported little theft. Apart from one example on a notice board, we found no graffiti. Prisoners did not display offensive posters. Two rooms were adapted for wheelchair users.
- 2.3 The main corridor running between the eastern and western residential units was in poor condition. The floor was uneven and had exposed drain covers. The walls were damp and had peeling paint. Prisoners worked hard to clean showers and toilets but most were in very poor condition – they had cracked tiles, mould and rusty pipe-work. Some showers regularly ran out of hot water. There were no microwaves or toasters in residential units although there were plans to introduce them in P5 and P6 units.
- 2.4 In our survey, 83% of prisoners said it was easy to make an application but only 64% said applications were dealt with fairly, less than the comparator (70%). Prisoners could submit complaints in a box in the central corridor or take them to the relevant department. Applications were available from the prisoner information desk (PID). The PID worker was a valuable resource and helped prisoners direct their applications to the correct department. However, he did not have access to a standalone computer or printer, which would have improved the service.
- 2.5 Most prisoners wore their own clothes. Laundry arrangements were adequate and men could easily exchange bedding and prison clothes. Prisoners could borrow irons and ironing boards from the central office. Some telephones were not working. Arrangements for receiving and sending mail were adequate.

### Recommendations

- 2.6 **Prisoners should be able to store valuables and medication securely.** (Repeated recommendation 2.9)
- 2.7 **All showers and toilets should be clean and in a good state of repair.**

## 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.**

- 2.8** In our survey, prisoners were less positive than the comparator about all aspects of prisoner and staff relationships. Only two-thirds (67%) said most staff treated them with respect.
- 2.9** We observed generally respectful interactions between staff and prisoners, particularly in the specialist areas of work, where men spoke highly of the support they received. We saw helpful interactions in the central office, where men could get queries dealt with quickly and efficiently.
- 2.10** However, too few men felt staff supported them. This might have been connected to expectations they had after living in closed establishments and short lengths of stay at Sudbury, which sometimes meant staff did not know the men well. However, the reasons for this perception needed addressing. Many prisoners complained about a small, but influential, group of discipline staff whose behaviour and attitudes were problematic. While we were assured that management was taking appropriate action, these staff had a disproportionate impact on the men.
- 2.11** The personal officer scheme was not embedded and personal officers did not always contribute effectively to sentence planning or release processes. Electronic case notes contained few entries and there was little evidence that personal officers had regular meaningful contact with the men, which was not in line with the prison's policy. The scheme was not being effectively managed.
- 2.12** Consultation arrangements were well established, matters were discussed thoroughly and openly and minutes were available. However, few men were involved in the consultation process. Involving a wider cross-section of men would have made this more effective.

## 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 characteristic<sup>3</sup> are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.**

### Strategic management

- 2.13** Equalities work was under-resourced but developing across the prison. There were two equalities officers who were meant to spend 30 hours a week on this work. However, they were often redeployed to other duties. The equality policy was up to date and covered all protected characteristics.

---

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

- 2.14** Each protected characteristic was allocated a member of the senior management team (SMT), who took the lead on promoting and overseeing the work, but they were not yet embedded across the prison. Men were asked about their needs on reception.
- 2.15** The equality action team met quarterly and operational heads' attendance was good. However, staff from other areas, such as the chaplaincy and education, and prisoner equality representatives only attended more sporadically. It was difficult to recruit and retain men as equality representatives because of the population turnover and the number of men on release on temporary licence (ROTL). There was no job description or training for representatives and their work was not adequately supported. Equality was promoted well through the library and education department.
- 2.16** Diversity data from the HM Prison and Probation Service monitoring tool was six months out of date, which made it less relevant because around two thirds of the population had been at the prison less than six months. The prison planned to develop local monitoring to ensure information was up to date. Data that had been analysed had not flagged up concerns about different treatment. However, the process needed to be more systematic. The prison did not publicise ROTL or release outcomes for different groups across the prison, which could have ensured transparency, nor did it consult men from all protected characteristic groups.
- 2.17** Few discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) were submitted and the number was falling. Ten had been submitted in the six months before the inspection, many of them via the general complaints system. Although we saw that some general complaint forms containing equality issues had been submitted for DIRF investigation, others had not. Investigations were thorough, staff spoke to prisoners about their concerns and in some cases appropriate action was taken and lessons learnt. Not all investigations were timely due to a lack of staff. The prison had attempted to have DIRF responses scrutinised externally, but had been unsuccessful owing to a lack of funding and responses were now quality assured internally. Quality assurance was appropriate.

## Recommendation

- 2.18 Men from all protected characteristic groups should be consulted and data should be monitored systematically and used to inform a meaningful action plan.**

## Protected characteristics

- 2.19** Around 40% of the population was from a black and minority ethnic background. In our survey, this group had similar views to other prisoner in most areas, but almost a third (32%) said they had experienced victimisation from staff compared with 15% of white prisoners and more (13%) said they felt unsafe at the time of the inspection compared with their white counterparts (5%). No consultation had taken place with this group to determine the reasons for their perceptions. Only a third, compared with half of white prisoners, reported being located near to their home area.
- 2.20** In our survey, six men identified as being from a Traveller background, more than the number on P-NOMIS (the Prison Service IT system) and prisoners told us there were others who had not disclosed their background to prison staff. We were told that men were concerned that ROTL applications from Travellers would be dealt with less favourably. (See paragraph 2.16.)

- 2.21** The small number of foreign national prisoners at Sudbury had permanent leave to remain in the UK and did not require additional immigration or welfare services. Foreign national men were underrepresented at the prison, suggesting that other prisons were not re-categorising this group as open status prisoners as often as possible. Translation services were available for men with language needs although staff had not used them recently and the library had a good selection of material in other languages.
- 2.22** Men were generally positive about their religious beliefs being respected (see paragraph 2.28). One in five men were Muslim and in our survey, while they were happy about faith provision generally, they were more negative about being victimised by staff and other prisoners, which prison staff needed to explore.
- 2.23** Men with physical disabilities or additional needs were generally located in West 7 unit. The unit had some adapted cells, a shower room and toilet, that while accessible, were in poor repair. The function of the unit was described to us in different ways and the criteria for allocation were not clear. Men without specific needs had also been allocated there because there was no space elsewhere in the prison, which meant the more vulnerable men felt even more insecure. Careful management and oversight of the unit was needed.
- 2.24** Support for men with disabilities was generally appropriate and the referral system for a needs assessment and adaptations was sound. However, as at our last inspection, there was still no formal carer scheme. Informal peer support was available, but it lacked sufficient oversight. Personal emergency and evacuation plans were held centrally, contained sufficient and relevant information and were up to date.
- 2.25** Older prisoners were consulted effectively through a fortnightly group for men aged 55 and over. In our survey, this group was more positive than others when it came to staff treating them with respect and speaking to them during association. However, as at our last inspection, activities for this group needed developing and the only age-appropriate provision was a weekly gym session. In our survey, men over 50 were less likely than others to attend the gym three times or more a week. Older men had been provided with assistance to obtain bus passes and there were plans to enable more of them to benefit from appropriate ROTL placements, for example through volunteer placements, but they were still in development. Almost 30% of men were under 30. The prison had tried to involve younger men in forums, but there had been little interest.
- 2.26** There were no transgender prisoners at Sudbury at the time of the inspection, but staff had sufficient expertise to provide appropriate support if necessary. In our survey, five men described themselves as gay or bisexual, although it had not been recorded on P-NOMIS. Efforts had been made to work with this group and information about support services was available. We saw DIRF investigations that demonstrated that homophobic comments from prisoners were challenged and dealt with appropriately.

## Recommendation

- 2.27** **The purpose of and allocation criteria for West 7 unit should be clarified. Peer support for men with disabilities should be formally implemented and appropriately supervised.**

## 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.**

- 2.28** It was positive that in our survey, more than at our last inspection (61% against 50%) said their religious beliefs were respected. Black and minority ethnic and Muslim men were particularly positive. More men from these groups than others also felt they could speak to a religious leader in private. Since the recruitment of a full-time managing chaplain, the chaplaincy had become more visible across the prison and men spoke highly of the team.
- 2.29** The chaplaincy had good facilities, which were welcoming and peaceful and supported by committed orderlies. The chapel and multi-faith room were very accessible and men could drop in when they did not have scheduled activities. Men appreciated these facilities and we saw them being used for personal worship. Since our last inspection washing facilities had been installed for Muslim prayers.
- 2.30** Provision for all faiths was good. The prison had found it difficult to appoint part-time Roman Catholic and Anglican chaplains and a sessional Rastafarian chaplain. However, corporate worship for these groups was still organised and all statutory duties were met. The chaplaincy had also organised family visits, provided pastoral support in times of crisis and had a bereavement counsellor.
- 2.31** Evening activities led by the team included quizzes and music groups run by the prisoners. The chaplaincy had good links with kitchen staff, who consulted prisoners about food for festivals and involved them in preparing it.
- 2.32** Prisoners were encouraged to consider their faith as a tool for successful resettlement. All men had a discharge interview with the chaplains who could help them to link up with faith communities on release.

## 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.**

- 2.33** In our survey, only 44% of men (against the comparator of 53%) said it was easy to make a complaint. Complaints forms were available via the central office, the PID desk or in the library but not in units. Complaint boxes were emptied by non-uniformed staff, which was good.
- 2.34** More than one in five respondents to our survey said they had been prevented from making a complaint, which was higher than in comparator prisons. As at our last inspection, prisoners thought that complaining could lead to a transfer back to closed conditions. Although we found no evidence for this, it was a concern that men repeatedly raised during the inspection and the prison needed to do more to address this fear.
- 2.35** We saw some complaints that should have been treated as DIRFs (see paragraph 2.17) and some medical complaints were logged as general complaints. There was some crossover between the different complaints systems and the process needed clarifying.

- 2.36** The responses to complaints we sampled were legible, polite and timely. The majority were thorough and we saw some excellent responses, but we also saw some replies that could have been more helpful. Complaints about staff were dealt with appropriately.
- 2.37** Most complaints were about offender management matters (such as sentence progression or ROTL) or property, some of which concerned other prisons. Quality assurance was reasonable. Complaints were monitored well by the SMT and analysis of the issues was effective. We saw evidence that action had been taken on complaints about property, which was good.

## 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.**

- 2.38** Only 41% of respondents to our survey said it was easy to communicate with their lawyer and only 28% said it was easy to attend legal visits, both lower than at other open prisons. Four rooms, which enabled discussions to be held in confidence, were now available for legal visits. Legal visits took place on Tuesdays only, which could have made it difficult for solicitors working at court and with other commitments to attend.
- 2.39** Systems for tracking when legal mail was opened in error were good and fewer men than at our last inspection said it was a problem. There was a good selection of legal books in the library, word processing facilities were available for men involved in legal cases and library orderlies would photocopy Prison Service instructions on request. Information about legal services was available from the PID desk.

## 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.**

- 2.40** The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)<sup>4</sup> and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies. The CQC found there were no breaches of the relevant regulations.

## Governance arrangements

- 2.41** Care UK Clinical Services Limited had been the lead health provider since April 2016. Well attended regular governance and quality assurance meetings supported effective collaborative working between the prison, health providers and commissioners. An up-to-date health needs assessment and lessons learned from clinical incidents informed service provision.

<sup>4</sup> CQC is the independent regulator of health and adult social care in England. It monitors, inspects and regulates services to make sure they meet fundamental standards of quality and safety. For information on CQC's standards of care and the action it takes to improve services, please visit: <http://www.cqc.org.uk>.



Health care forums were poorly attended, although consultation with the prison council was good and regular patient feedback surveys were completed.

- 2.42** In our survey, only 44% of prisoners said the overall quality of health services was good compared with 66% in similar prisons. Feedback from men we spoke to was mixed, although several issues emerged, including waiting times, multiple appointments to resolve issues and behavioural warnings for non-attendance.
- 2.43** Care UK had inherited significant staffing shortages, which were being resolved, but had affected service development and might have contributed to some negative perceptions. Overall, we considered health services reasonably good. We observed excellent visible clinical leadership and teamwork. Health staff were easily identifiable and the interactions we observed were very good. Health staff had good access to relevant current protocols and training. Most attended regular clinical and managerial supervision.
- 2.44** The small modern health care suite resembled a community practice and complied with required infection control standards. However, a lack of space sometimes inhibited service provision and storage space was very limited.
- 2.45** The health complaints, concerns and compliments system was appropriately confidential. The difference between concerns and complaints was unclear; Care UK treated all issues that could have been resolved locally as a concern, even if the prisoner indicated it was a complaint. An average of 10 complaints/concerns and eight compliments a month had been received since July 2016. Most complaints/concerns related to treatment issues. Responses we sampled were prompt, comprehensive and courteous.
- 2.46** Health staff had access to appropriate well checked and maintained emergency equipment. Discipline staff had could easily get to automated external defibrillators, however checking and maintenance processes were inadequate. Systems to ensure there was always first aid trained prison staff on duty were effective. Prison staff we spoke to knew emergency response protocols. Ambulances generally responded promptly, but the prison and health provider were working with the ambulance service and commissioners following two recent instances in which the ambulance service had not attended.
- 2.47** Appropriate health promotion information linked to monthly community campaigns was available in the health care department and across the prison. Access to community screening programmes for older prisoners had improved and was now good. Access to blood borne virus testing, immunisations, smoking cessation programmes and sexual health screening was good. Condoms were freely available in the waiting room.

## Recommendations

- 2.48 Prisoners should be able to raise complaints and concerns through a clear and well understood system.**
- 2.49 Prison staff should have easy access to regularly checked and well-maintained automated external defibrillators.**

## Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.50** Nurses completed a comprehensive health screening for all new arrivals, and those with significant health needs received a further assessment in the following days. Appropriate onward referrals were made. Some prisoners arrived without sufficient medication, which

was usually resolved promptly. New arrivals received a welcome pack containing useful health forms for them to fill in and health promotion information, but there was no written information on the services provided other than for the pharmacy. A new practice leaflet was being developed. Prisoners could use the application system or attend the health department to request an appointment.

- 2.51** The range of clinics was appropriate, effective systems were in place to prioritise clinical needs and non-attendance rates were low. Waiting times for the optician and physiotherapist were excessive at around 11 weeks, although additional sessions were being considered to reduce this.
- 2.52** In our survey, only 28% of prisoners said it was easy to see a doctor. There were four GP clinics a week and one evening clinic fortnightly for those working outside the prison. A nurse prescriber also provided three clinics a week. Waiting times for routine daytime GP appointments averaged around two weeks, although during the inspection it was three to four weeks for evening appointments. Many prisoners requesting a GP were assessed by a nurse, which might have exacerbated prisoners' negative perceptions about access to the doctor.
- 2.53** We were told the out-of-hours' GP cover provided by the community service was generally effective, although it had recently erroneously declined to assess a patient, a problem that was being addressed.
- 2.54** Access to nurses appeared good – the service included twice daily drop-in sessions and late opening twice a week, although in our survey fewer men than comparator prisons said it was easy to see a nurse (52% against 73%). Prisoners with lifelong conditions and complex issues were identified and monitored effectively. Emerging clinical issues were discussed at a daily multidisciplinary meeting and those with significant needs had their cases discussed at the weekly complex case meeting. Clinical record keeping was generally good and care plans were in place, although some were not sufficiently tailored to the individual.
- 2.55** The prison had no dedicated end of life facilities, but equipment was obtained when required. Effective care planning, involving community services, the prison, health care department and the patient, supported compassionate care.
- 2.56** External health appointments were well managed and rarely cancelled due to lack of prison staff escorts or on security grounds.

## Recommendation

- 2.57** **Prisoners should receive all primary care services within community-equivalent waiting times.**

## Pharmacy

- 2.58** An external provider supplied medicines once a day in appropriate packaging. Prisoners and health staff said medicine reordering had been poorly managed until January 2017 when more robust systems had been embedded.
- 2.59** The governance of medicines management had improved since our last inspection. Medicines were stored securely and were well organised. An appropriate stock of emergency and critical medication was held and its use was generally recorded and monitored adequately.

Errors, near misses, drug alerts and refrigerator temperatures were managed appropriately. Current protocols, procedures and prescribing guidance were available.

- 2.60** Stock and named patient controlled drugs were inappropriately stored together and a patient's supply had been incorrectly added to the stock balance for one drug. The controlled drug register did not comply with current regulations.
- 2.61** A pharmacist attended every six months to complete required clinical audits. They also provided patient advice and carried out reviews on request. Monthly well-attended local medicines and therapeutics meetings addressed all pertinent issues. A locum pharmacy technician offered regular input and a part-time pharmacy technician was being recruited to further develop governance and pharmacy services.
- 2.62** Prescribing and administration was completed electronically. Appropriate in-possession risk assessments were generally completed promptly and in-house systems identified those who had not been assessed. However, during our inspection 17 prisoners had waited over eight weeks for an assessment. In-possession medicines were administered once a day at 11.30am. Prisoners ordered their own monthly repeat and ad hoc medication every month, which gave them some responsibility. The administration we observed was safe and respectful. Controlled drugs were administered separately at 7.40am with an officer in attendance.
- 2.63** Other supervised medication was administered three times a day at 8.10am, 11.30am and 4.10pm, which meant prisoners received three doses in eight hours and none for 16 hours if they were receiving medicine three times a day, which was not clinically appropriate. Compared to other open prisons, Sudbury took a more conservative approach to providing some known tradeable medicines in possession, which some prisoners were dissatisfied with. This was gradually being addressed and appropriate safety measures introduced to reduce diversion. Overall the tradeable medicines prescribed appeared appropriate and were monitored effectively.
- 2.64** Nurses could still only administer a few medicines to treat minor ailments without a doctor's prescription, which created unnecessary delays while they were prescribed. New policies to address the issue were being finalised.

## Recommendations

- 2.65** **Controlled drugs should be stored and recorded in accordance with current guidance and legislation.**
- 2.66** **Nurses should be able to administer a clinically appropriate range of over-the-counter medicines without a prescription.**

## Dentistry

- 2.67** In our survey, only 16% of men said they had good access to the dentist, although 52% of those who had seen the dentist found the quality of the service good. A community-equivalent range of dental services was available. Care UK had doubled the number of dental sessions to four to reduce the long waiting lists they inherited. However, demand was high and waiting times remained too long for routine appointments at eight to nine weeks. Appointments were prioritised according to clinical need and arrangements for dental emergencies were appropriate.

- 2.68** The dental suite looked clean and decontamination arrangements were appropriate. However, some health care stock was inappropriately stored in the dental decontamination room, which we were advised would be addressed. Most dental equipment was suitably maintained, but the dental chair had been overdue a service since January 2017.

## Recommendation

- 2.69 Prisoners requiring routine dental assessments should be seen within six weeks.**

## Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.70** Joint working between the prison, health and mental health staff was very good, however discipline staff had no regular mental health awareness training.
- 2.71** In our survey, 17% said they had emotional well-being or mental health problems, but only 46% of them said they were receiving help. Prisoners could refer themselves or be referred by any staff member and all received an initial face-to-face assessment to identify their needs. In the previous six months, between 13 and 22 referrals had been received per month.
- 2.72** Primary mental health provision had increased since our last inspection and overall the care provided was good, but the range of services remained too limited. The primary mental health nurse provided at least three clinics a week. During the inspection, the service only supported three men, but 15 were awaiting an initial assessment. Waiting times for an assessment averaged two to three weeks, although those with urgent needs were seen more promptly. There was no counselling service and no psychologically informed interventions, although some mental health education groups were being introduced.
- 2.73** A dual qualified mental health and learning disability nurse provided three clinics a fortnight and a psychiatrist one clinic a fortnight for prisoners with moderate to severe mental illness. A clinical psychologist provided one clinic every three weeks. All referrals to the secondary mental health team came through primary mental health. During the inspection, the secondary mental health team was supporting 11 men, one of whom was seeing the clinical psychologist. Four men were awaiting assessment and waiting times had increased following a recent spike in referrals to around four weeks, although those with more critical needs were seen quickly.
- 2.74** Clinical records demonstrated that men receiving support from both mental health teams received good levels of support. There had been no transfers under the Mental Health Act or to closed conditions on mental health grounds in the past year. One man experiencing a significant mental health crisis had received a substantial amount of support, including a prolonged constant watch and one-to-one supervision, to help him recover, which was commendable.

## Recommendations

- 2.75 Prison staff should have regular mental health awareness training.**
- 2.76 Prisoners should have timely access to a community-equivalent range of mental health services, including psychological interventions and counselling.**

## Social care

**2.77** Prisoners with social care needs were promptly identified and referred for assessment. Two social workers from Derbyshire Council provided full-time input at HMP Sudbury and HMP Foston Hall and were well integrated into the prison and health care department. Sixteen men had been referred for social care assessments in the previous six months, most had required professional support or were directed to appropriate agencies. Only two had required packages of care. Assessments were prompt and carers attended as required. We observed effective partnership-working between the prison, council, health providers and carers, so that a comprehensive care package for a man with urgent needs could be established.

## Good practice

**2.78** *A high level of social worker resource and effective partnership-working between social workers, health providers and the prison meant those with social care needs received an exemplary service.*

## 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.**

- 2.79** In our survey, 42% of respondents said the food was either good or very good, compared with only 31% of prisoners at the last inspection.
- 2.80** All food, including cold food at lunch time and the hot meal in the evening, were now pre-selected, which reduced the risk of bullying and other inappropriate prisoner behaviour while they were queuing up. We found the food to be reasonable and quantities appeared sufficient.
- 2.81** Prisoners collected their breakfast for the following day at lunchtime and those working outside the prison during the week collected their breakfast for the week at the weekend. Prisoners we spoke to were reasonably happy with these arrangements. Those who worked outside the prison during the day also had the option of having a hot evening meal saved for them in insulated boxes, although only relatively few took up this option. Many prisoners got back in time to eat an evening meal. Many who were undertaking paid work chose not to eat the prison meal and bought their own food.
- 2.82** Consultation arrangements were good. Monthly meetings were held between prisoner food representatives and the catering manager. Notes from these meetings indicated that areas of concern received an appropriate response from the prison. There were still no self-catering facilities although the prison planned to introduce them. This appeared partly to be because of problems with power supplies. Although the matter was on the agenda of the prisoner consultation group and some basic equipment like microwave ovens and toasters had been ordered, facilities remained too limited.
- 2.83** Both the kitchen and servery areas were kept reasonably clean and food was stored appropriately. National vocational qualifications at level 1 were available for those working in the main kitchen and up to level two for prisoners working in the staff mess.

## Recommendation

**2.84 Prisoners should be able to self-cater.** (Repeated recommendation 2.125)

## Purchases

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.85** In our survey, 75% of prisoners said the shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs, more than the 54% in comparator prisons or 51% at the last inspection.
- 2.86** The range of items sold by the shop was not reviewed formally, but some informal consultation had been undertaken through PID representatives. The prison had significantly extended the range of products available in its shop at the beginning of March 2017.
- 2.87** As at the last inspection, there could still be a delay of up to nine days before a newly arrived prisoner could receive a full shop order. However, the prison had now introduced a range of grocery and other packs that prisoners could buy when they first arrived. In our survey, 29% of prisoners compared with only 18% at the last inspection said they had access to the shop when they first arrived at the prison.
- 2.88** Prisoners could buy items from a range of catalogues. Men we spoke to were reasonably positive about the procedure but complained there could sometimes be delays. It was inappropriate that the prison charged an administrative fee.

## 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.<sup>5</sup>**

- 3.1** The amount of time prisoners could spend out of their rooms was excellent. They were not locked in their rooms but were expected to return to their units before 8.45pm. Prisoners then had to be in their rooms from midnight until 7.30am. Men had good access to the prison grounds and to a wide range of recreational activities. These included snooker with recently refurbished tables and the dining room, where men could organise quizzes and board game tournaments. The prison also ran two music groups.

### 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.**

- 3.2** *Ofsted<sup>6</sup> made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

<b>Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work:</b>	<i>Good</i>
<i>Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Good</i>
<i>Quality of learning and skills and work provision, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment:</i>	<i>Good</i>
<i>Personal development and behaviour:</i>	<i>Good</i>
<i>Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Good</i>

### Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.3** Since the previous inspection, the prison had successfully developed the provision so that it addressed most of prisoners' career aspirations to support resettlement. Arrangements for allocating and preparing prisoners for activities, including release on temporary licence (ROTL), were generally effective.

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

- 3.4** The quality of the education and training provision provided by Milton Keynes College was good. Education staff received good, appropriate training that improved their professional practice. The college and prison had a productive partnership that had led to higher standards.
- 3.5** Leaders and managers used the outcome of a thorough self-assessment to drive improvements across the provision. A quality improvement group appropriately monitored the plans to raise standards. Managers assessed the provision through observations, which they used well to enhance the quality of taught sessions. However, monitoring of the small amount of subcontracted and prison provision required improvement.
- 3.6** Managers had introduced a range of career progression routes, known as Pipelines, which helped prisoners clarify their short- and long-term goals. However, the men's initial induction did not ensure they all adequately understood what employment opportunities were available through Pipelines. In a small number of cases, managers did not ensure the initiative was used flexibly enough to cater for changes in prisoners' career aspirations.

## Recommendations

- 3.7 The Offenders' Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) and prison provision should be subject to appropriate quality assurance arrangements.**
- 3.8 Prisoners' understanding of career progression routes should be improved and tailored to support the men's successful resettlement.**

## Provision of activities

- 3.9** The prison offered enough purposeful activity places to occupy all prisoners. The range and breadth of vocational training was good and generally appropriate. The prison's use of part-time work and education effectively met prisoners' needs. Overall, there was a good range of challenging work opportunities. Prisoners with construction trade backgrounds were used to work on innovative prison projects. Pay rates did not discourage men from participating in activities. Allocations were fair and equitable. The provision of education and accredited training for those with shorter stays was limited.
- 3.10** During the inspection, 109 learners attended education classes. The provision included English and maths at levels 1 to 2 and information and communication technology (ICT) at entry level. Courses also included art, business studies, personal budgeting, customer services, and counselling skills. Catering and Barista qualifications were also offered.
- 3.11** There were 52 full-time places in the vocational workshops, providing training at level 2 in bricklaying, painting and decorating, plastering and tiling, rail track maintenance, frame-making and French polishing. A range of other vocational courses was available, including horticulture, food safety and textiles production.
- 3.12** The prison had 463 full-time work places. Typically, 5% of prisoners undertook accredited qualifications while working but not all of them had the opportunity to do so. A suitable variety of work activities was undertaken in prison areas, including in the wood mill, farm shop, laundry, gardens and waste disposal. Orderly work included activities in the chapel, education, gym, library and health care department.



- 3.13** During the inspection, 129 prisoners were on ROTL at a range of paid and unpaid placements in the local community. The prison supported 19 learners who were on distance learning and Open University programmes. Five of them were studying at level 3.

## Recommendations

- 3.14 Prisoners with short sentences left to serve should be provided with relevant education and accredited training.**
- 3.15 Prisoners should be able to gain accredited vocational qualifications in all work activities.**

## Quality of provision

- 3.16** Taught sessions in classroom-based education sessions and vocational training workshops were generally good. Prisoners valued the support they received from peer mentors. However, mentors predominantly had a teaching background and no training programme for prisoners with other career experiences was in place. The support and supervision mentors received required improvement.
- 3.17** The prison's vocational workshops provided very good training. Learners worked diligently and made good progress, particularly in catering and construction skills. Learning plans were used well to plan and track individual learners' progress. Teachers were knowledgeable and enthusiastic and had relevant industrial experience. They made good use of opportunities to reinforce prisoners' English and maths skills. The prison and college had developed commercial facilities such as the Secret Diner restaurant, which was open to the public and provided an outstanding training environment for catering and customer service. Teaching and resources for the railway track maintenance course were very good and prepared learners well for jobs in the industry.
- 3.18** Education classrooms were well equipped and spacious. Most prisoners on education courses, particularly those taking functional skills English or maths or ICT courses were keen to learn and took their studies seriously. Tutors used a good range of effective teaching strategies and resources to deliver personalised learning, enliven sessions and explore topics in engaging ways. Most tutors used detailed learner profiles well to shape effective individual teaching and learning and set challenging targets. Tutors made good use of specialist additional learning to support learners with barriers to learning or additional needs. They did not, however, consistently use individual learning plans or learning logs well enough to either record or improve learners' progress.
- 3.19** The work available in the prison and industry workshops offered an appropriate quality of employment related experience. However, prisoners were not always fully occupied in the carpentry or textile workshops. Few prisoners had learning plans and the employment skills they had developed were not recognised or recorded.

## Recommendations

- 3.20** Peer mentors should have appropriate support and supervision and be drawn from a wide range of previous career backgrounds.
- 3.21** All prisoners' learning should be appropriately planned and monitored, and where relevant, the employment skills they develop should be recognised and recorded.

## Personal development and behaviour

- 3.22** Prisoners demonstrated a high standard of behaviour in education, training, and work. They were respectful towards tutors, instructors, and other prisoners, which created a calm and positive learning and work environment. Most prisoners spoke enthusiastically about how they had become involved and interested in learning, often reluctantly at first. They recognised that their self-confidence and self-esteem had grown.
- 3.23** Attendance and punctuality were generally good. In education and vocational training workshops, learners said they enjoyed their courses. Tutors encouraged teamwork, which was particularly evident in areas such as the Secret Diner restaurant. Prisoners responded well when they were given greater responsibility and the opportunity to contribute to the prison. For example, prisoners qualified in construction trades had taken responsibility for the refurbishment of a building and built a new facility to a high standard.
- 3.24** Most prisoners undertaking work took pride in their roles. Those in the gardens work party, for example, quickly assumed responsibility for maintaining specific areas, producing attractive gardens with minimal supervision. Men enthusiastically developed projects, such as a 'Buddha garden' beside the multi-faith centre. Prisoners who worked outside the prison as part of the ROTL scheme had a good understanding of employers' requirements and performed well in their job roles.

## Education and vocational achievements

- 3.25** Achievements of accredited qualifications for most courses was high, as were retention rates. This was particularly the case for ICT, although the number of learners in the previous and current academic years was relatively low. Learners' achievements were high on all personal development courses.
- 3.26** Pass rates for learners who completed vocational training were high, particularly for railway track maintenance and painting and decorating courses. Prisoners worked purposefully and achieved good standards, sometimes exceeding the requirements of the qualification. In plastering, furniture refurbishment and catering some of the completed work was outstanding. Overall, learners generally progressed at least as much as they were expected to.
- 3.27** In the 2015–16 academic year, prisoners' achievement rates in functional skills English and maths were very low, particularly at level 2. Retention rates on these courses were low. In this period, relatively few prisoners took courses in functional skills English and maths even though many had low language, literacy and numeracy levels. In the current academic year, the number of learners attending functional skills courses was already much higher than in the whole of the previous year. College data indicated learners' achievements and retention rates, notably in English, were showing signs of good improvement.

## Library

- 3.28** The prison library service was outstanding. Library managers worked in close partnership with prison departments and external libraries to ensure the service met users' needs.
- 3.29** Prisoners had very good drop-in access to the library during weekdays, including on four weekday evenings and Saturday mornings. Experienced library staff developed the provision, which had led to substantial increases in the already large number of prisoner visits and loans. Data for 2016–17 showed that the number of books, CDs and DVDs issued had risen by a third, to over 32,500, and the number of prisoner visits had grown by 27% to 78,400. The team of four library orderlies could follow national vocational qualification programmes in customer service.
- 3.30** Managers had organised the library into different zones and themes reflecting 'imagination', 'inspiration and 'information', which had broadened prisoners' reading interests. The library ran effective literacy events throughout the year, such as the Reading Ahead Challenge. They were well supported by prisoners. The Storybook Dads project (in which prisoners record stories for their children) was very well staffed and valued by users. Prison Service orders and relevant legal texts were available, along with a good range of daily newspapers and magazines. Stock losses were low.

## 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.**

- 3.31** Prisoners had good access to well-managed physical education (PE) facilities. Sessions were offered each week day and at weekends, as well as on four weekday evenings. This ensured that prisoners working outside the prison had access to sessions. In our survey, 54% of prisoners said they used the gym at least three times a week. However, men left vocational workshops and work to attend recreational gym, which was inappropriate.
- 3.32** The prison had an adequately equipped cardiovascular suite and weights room. PE staff monitored the use of these facilities and warned prisoners of the dangers of steroid misuse to enhance performance. There was a well-maintained football pitch and prisoners participated in the Uttoxeter local league. Since the previous inspection, the cricket pitch had been taken out of use. Limited use was made of the sports hall as the lighting was awaiting repair. Shower and changing areas were clean and appropriately maintained. Prisoners could obtain clean PE kit and suitable footwear from the clothing exchange stores.
- 3.33** The four PE department staff were suitably qualified and experienced. Five orderlies supported them. All prisoners attended a detailed gym induction that included a personal health concerns declaration. PE staff worked effectively with the health care department to provide remedial gym sessions to improve prisoners' physical and mental health. PE staff promoted the benefits of a healthy lifestyle and offered specific classes for older prisoners.
- 3.34** Prisoners who had relevant vocational qualifications provided classes in yoga and circuit training. During the inspection, the prison offered a very limited range of low-level accredited courses. The use of ROTL to allow prisoners to gain experience in PE vocational areas needed to be developed further.

## Recommendations

- 3.35 Recreational gym should be scheduled so that it does not disrupt the core working day.**
- 3.36 ROTL and vocational courses should be offered to help prisoners develop their employability in PE-related areas of work.**

## 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 Strategic management of resettlement had improved significantly since our last inspection. A very good needs analysis had been undertaken, based on a range of information, including data from offender assessment system (OASys) documents. The needs analysis was supported by a regular survey of prisoners' views, which provided further valuable evidence. However, the needs analysis did not yet fully explore the different issues faced by the diverse population held at HMP Sudbury, for example, black and minority ethnic men, younger prisoners or those serving an indeterminate sentence.
- 4.2 The number of prisoners arriving at open conditions with very little time left to serve in custody had increased significantly. The high population turnover meant that some departments were under additional pressure because, for example, they had to do more assessments.
- 4.3 The reducing reoffending committee now met monthly and was reasonably well attended. Detailed and clear action plans were in place and were regularly updated and service delivery improvements made as a result.
- 4.4 Links between the offender management unit (OMU), the Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire and Rutland Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) and the resettlement team had developed reasonably well and information exchange and joint working between the three functions were adequate.
- 4.5 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) had been used constructively for just over a third of prisoners in a typical week and on about 28,000 occasions in the previous year. There was a good range of paid and unpaid work placements and many men had progressed to having regular home leave. However, men arriving with less than 12 weeks to serve in custody were unlikely to progress to ROTL. In the previous few months prior to the inspection, about a quarter of men arriving could not take advantage of ROTL as a result, which meant they could not benefit from the resettlement opportunities provided by temporary release.

### Offender management and planning

#### Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.6 Offender management at Sudbury had improved since our last inspection. More offender supervisors were in post, including probation officers who specialised in managing higher risk cases. A small number of offender supervisor vacancies meant that caseloads were higher than they should have been, which placed additional pressure on those in post. Three

quarters of the population were serving lengthy custodial sentences of four years or more, 13% were indeterminate sentence prisoners and just under half posed a high risk of harm to others.

- 4.7** In our survey, significantly more prisoners than at our last inspection said they had a sentence plan and more than the comparator felt involved in its development. However, it was a concern that some prisoners arrived at Sudbury without a current OASys document or sentence plan to inform their move to open conditions. Once at Sudbury, most had a review of their OASys document and sentence plan, but in about 20 cases, including some high risk of harm prisoners managed by the National Probation Service, it was overdue. In some of the cases, the last OASys document had been completed over 18 months earlier and no longer provided an assessment of the risk posed by living in open conditions.
- 4.8** Almost all prisoners who responded to our survey said they had an offender supervisor; more than at our last inspection and compared with other prisons. Contact between offender supervisors and prisoners was more frequent than at our last inspection and meaningfully focused on ROTL risk assessment and planning. In our survey, more prisoners than at our last inspection and compared with other prisons said their offender supervisor was helping them achieve their targets. Offender supervisors contacted prisoners within 10 days of their arrival, which helped set realistic expectations about the prisoners' next steps. Regular drop-in sessions with offender supervisors also helped keep prisoners informed about their progress and the use of prisoner peer workers promoted communication between OMU staff and prisoners. However, some prisoners we spoke to said there was a lack of communication between them and their offender supervisor, but it was unclear why this was the case.
- 4.9** There was some evidence of contact between offender supervisors and prisoners to address offending behaviour, but offender supervisors acknowledged that they felt frustrated because of the limited amount of time they had to do this important work (see paragraph 4.52).
- 4.10** Home detention curfew (HDC) decisions were justifiable, processes reasonably well managed and all recent applications had been approved. Some prisoners were released after their eligibility date, caused by difficulties beyond the prison's control, which included prisoners arriving with only a few weeks left to serve before they were eligible for HDC and reports from community offender managers arriving late.

## Recommendation

- 4.11 The decision to move a prisoner to open conditions should be based on a current OASys risk and needs assessment document. The OASys risk management document and sentence plan should be reviewed following a prisoner's arrival in open conditions to reflect the change in their circumstances.**

## Public protection

- 4.12** Initial public protection checks and contact restrictions were appropriate and well managed. Very few men had their phone calls monitored and monitoring restrictions on individuals were regularly reviewed and removed at the earliest opportunity.
- 4.13** An inter-departmental risk management team (IRMT) had been established since our last inspection. Membership and attendance were reasonable, but the CRC was not yet involved. The IRMT reviewed public protection cases that were new to Sudbury, but high risk of harm cases and those subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) level 2

(where the active involvement of one or more agency is required) and level 3 (prisoners on the highest risk level), who were due for final release were not discussed. This limited its usefulness for risk management planning.

- 4.14** We were concerned that most prisoners did not have their MAPPA management level reviewed prior to unsupervised ROTL (including overnight stays) or well enough ahead of their final release. This potentially limited the prison's involvement in risk management planning. However, in one very high risk of harm case, the highest level of MAPPA management had been confirmed prior to the prisoner being allowed out on ROTL, which we thought was good. It gave all the agencies involved confidence in the restrictions placed on him.
- 4.15** ROTL risk assessment processes were mostly sound. Risk assessments in the restricted cases we reviewed were reasonably good and included the views of the external offender manager. However, there was no formal board meeting to determine if ROTL had been approved. The head of the OMU approved ROTL alone and neither the prisoner nor the offender supervisor was involved in a discussion about the risk management plan for a prisoner's first ROTL experience. This meant there was no opportunity to talk to the prisoner about his plans for ROTL to ensure they were realistic and achievable or to discuss any adjustments to those plans.

## Recommendations

- 4.16** **The IRMT should provide regular oversight of high risk cases in the last few months of the prisoner's custodial sentence and the CRC should be invited to attend meetings.**
- 4.17** **MAPPA management levels should be confirmed before a prisoner starts unsupervised ROTL, particularly for overnight releases, and well enough ahead of their final release to ensure comprehensive plans are developed.**
- 4.18** **The ROTL board meeting should involve the offender supervisor and the prisoner so that the plan for at least his first unsupervised ROTL experience can be explored to ensure the chair of the board is satisfied that all risks have been considered and appropriately managed.**

## Categorisation

- 4.19** Categorisation arrangements were appropriate. Prisoners demonstrating an increased risk of absconding or whose behaviour continued to be poor were reviewed at a suitability meeting to determine the best course of action and put plans in place to help them remain in open conditions. Evidence of those needing to be re-categorised and held in closed conditions indefinitely was clearly set out (see paragraph 1.34). However, some men were unnecessarily re-categorised to C when they had only been returned to closed conditions temporarily pending further investigation into their alleged behaviour.

## Recommendation

- 4.20** **Formal re-categorisation should only take place following an evidence-based decision to return a man to closed conditions indefinitely.**

## Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.21** During the inspection, 13% of the population were indeterminate sentence prisoners, which was considerably lower than the number held at our last inspection. The needs of this group had still not been analysed and there was very little specific provision for them. However, they were managed by probation officers who had more training and were more confident about carrying out this aspect of offender management than prison offender supervisors.
- 4.22** Parole report preparation was up to date and it was good that the prison planned to hold sessions to increase prisoners' awareness of what to expect at parole hearings. Men we spoke to raised as issues the lack of self-catering facilities (see paragraph 2.82) and independent living skills training.

## 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.**

- 4.23** The CRC undertook the prison's resettlement work. Demand for help was high – there were 46 releases a month, which was slightly more than at our last inspection. Our survey showed that respondents lacked an awareness of where to get help with resettlement matters.
- 4.24** Support was appropriately focused on providing advice and guidance, directing prisoners to sources of help so they could resolve their own problems, which was in keeping with the ethos of the prison. Prisoners who needed more help received additional support, including access to a specialist housing adviser and Citizens Advice.
- 4.25** Peer workers checked new arrivals' immediate resettlement needs. Issues were passed on to CRC staff, who made referrals or provided help to those who needed it.
- 4.26** Apart from those released on HDC, prisoners received a review of their resettlement plan 12 weeks before their release where time permitted. The plans we saw were adequate and we saw evidence of action being taken to address the concerns identified.

### Recommendation

- 4.27 Prisoners being assessed for HDC should have their resettlement needs reviewed prior to their release and action should be taken to address outstanding issues.**

### Accommodation

- 4.28** Accommodation provision was reasonably good. CRC staff directed men to community-based housing agencies, helped them to complete referrals or chase up applications.
- 4.29** We were told that nobody had been released without an address in the previous year and only a small number had gone into very temporary accommodation. Evidence showed that CRC staff had helped several prisoners who would otherwise have been homeless on release to find accommodation.



- 4.30** A specialist housing adviser visited the prison when necessary and had over the previous few months worked with a small number of men who were difficult to place. They had also delivered a Nowhere to Live workshop twice to 14 men, who were likely to be homeless. This helped them explore their options and develop plans for their release.
- 4.31** Referrals to Stonham Bass, a bail and HDC accommodation service, were made for those looking to be released on HDC and outcomes were positive.

## Education, training and employment

- 4.32** Partnership working between resettlement agencies were effective. All prisoners were seen by CRC staff, who offered a good range of interventions, including help with CV writing, job search skills, and disclosure rights (information about when and how to disclose convictions when applying for employment).
- 4.33** The quality of the National Careers Service provided by Futures Advice Skills and Employment was good. Careers advisers used up-to-date labour market information effectively to support prisoners' career decisions. The skills action plans produced by advisers were good and readily available to offender supervisors and managers. The prison used the plans to inform prisoners' activity allocations. Futures helped prisoners obtain additional work-related qualifications, such as the Construction Skills Certification Scheme site safety card and driving licences.
- 4.34** A Jobcentre Plus adviser ran a job club in a local library that enabled men subject to ROTL to search the internet for job vacancies and make applications. However, insufficient use was made of the prison's own virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities), particularly for men not subject to ROTL. Trained mentors provided pre-release support. Prisoners received details of a well-integrated package of support services available to them after release.
- 4.35** The prison had developed good relationships with employers so men undertaking ROTL could undertake paid work before completing their sentence. Arrangements to support and monitor the placements were generally effective. However, not all the opportunities offered included an accredited qualification to formally recognise the work skills being developed, for example, in forklift truck operation.
- 4.36** Prison data indicated that between October 2016 and March 2017, of 278 discharges, 25% went into full-time work, 19% became self-employed, and 9% obtained part-time work. Ninety-five prisoners were unemployed and the remainder included retired men and those who refused to disclose any information.

## Recommendations

- 4.37** **The prison should exploit in full the potential offered by the virtual campus.**
- 4.38** **Where practical, the prison should accredit the work skills achieved by men undertaking ROTL.**

## Health care

- 4.39** All prisoners were seen by health staff prior to release and provided with adequate supplies of medicines and information to support continuity of care in the community. Mental health nurses liaised appropriately with community services.

## Drugs and alcohol

- 4.40** The substance misuse team no longer ran pre-release groups, but one-to-one support was available to help prisoners prepare for release and continue their treatment in the community if required. The prison did not provide training on the use of naloxone (an opiate reversal agent) so men could treat an opiate overdose on release, which was a significant gap considering the increasing rate of drug overdoses in the community.

## Recommendation

- 4.41** **Men who require it should have access to training on naloxone and be given a supply on release.**

## Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.42** Demand for help with money problems was high. A range of support was available, including access to a Citizens Advice worker twice a month. Jobcentre Plus helped establish benefit claims on release. CRC staff could help prisoners contact creditors so they could set up repayment plans or deal with court fines. The free telephone number for the National Debt Advice Line was being added to every prisoner's phone account. The education department ran a budgeting course. Prisoners could open bank accounts and 345 applications had been processed in the previous year, which was very high.

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.43** Children and families work was discussed regularly at the reducing reoffending meeting and an action plan took the work forward. There were plans to develop services and prison staff were beginning to work with external agencies so further resources could be brought into the prison.
- 4.44** The library ran initiatives in which men could record stories for their children (see paragraph 3.30) as well as a project enabling fathers to maintain contact with older children. Library staff had developed a Home Zone area with resettlement resources, including material about strengthening family relationships.
- 4.45** A good range of parenting and relationship courses was offered through the CRC and the Prison Advice and Care Trust (PACT). They included a one-day course looking at the impact of imprisonment on families, a family literacy in prisons project and an in-depth course for men and their families pre-release.
- 4.46** Families told us it could be difficult to book visits. Five sessions for up to 28 prisoners ran weekly and men who were on the enhanced level were entitled to a weekly visit. Visits could be booked up to four weeks in advance.

- 4.47** Waiting facilities for visitors were inadequate and the process was unclear. Some visitors arrived at the prison very early to be sure of their place in the line. They could wait in a locker hut before the visitors' waiting room opened, which was an hour before visits started. The waiting room had 12 seats for around 50 visitors and was cramped. Although refreshments and toilets were available at the café, which was in another building, they were not well signposted or used by visitors. The prison had no specific arrangements or information for families that had not visited before. It was good that families could hand in property. Processing visitors' identification documents and searches were carried out appropriately.
- 4.48** The visits hall was attractive and welcoming, and one wall contained pictures made by children on previous visits. The atmosphere was relaxed and staff were friendly. There was a good play area and visitors could buy refreshments.
- 4.49** Family visits ran at least seven times a year, during the school holidays. Prisoners were involved in planning and organising the visits. The visits also enabled fathers to have individual quality time with their children, which supported parenting skills.

## Recommendation

- 4.50** **The waiting arrangements for visitors should be improved.**

## Good practice

- 4.51** *Men had the opportunity to take responsibility for planning and organising family visits, which allowed them to spend quality time with their children. The process emphasised the importance of family ties and men taking more responsibility for parenting.*

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.52** The prison found it hard to provide prisoners with access to offending behaviour work, despite the high level of need. Men could still not benefit from accredited programme places in the community and offender supervisors only had a limited amount of time for one-to-one offending behaviour work.
- 4.53** Two prisoners were potentially facing a return to closed conditions to be assessed for a programme, which they understandably felt was not a positive way forward. The OMU was exploring other options, such as carrying out a suitability assessment while prisoners were in open conditions. However, there was no formal long-term strategy to prevent prisoners from having to return to closed conditions when they still had outstanding programme needs.
- 4.54** Enhanced behavioural management (a scheme providing high-risk prisoners with additional support) enabled the prison to manage some of the higher risk prisoners. All prisoners were assessed on arrival and those placed on the scheme were monitored for six months. They had a series of meetings with an offender supervisor to oversee ongoing risk factors and help the prisoner build coping skills. The final module of the Self Change Programme continued to be delivered on a one-to-one basis to a very small number of eligible men.

## Recommendation

- 4.55 Access to offending behaviour work should be reviewed and appropriate action taken to ensure all prisoners' needs are addressed while they are in open conditions.**

## Additional resettlement services

- 4.56** Services to support victims of domestic abuse or those involved as sex workers in the community had not been well developed. Although prisoners were asked about these issues on arrival, help was limited to providing information about support agencies in the community.

## Recommendation

- 4.57 Support for victims of domestic violence or those involved as sex workers in the community should be reviewed and more proactive help provided.**

# Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice

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

## Main recommendation

To the governor

- 5.1** The prison should ensure that staff provide prisoners with appropriate and regular support to help them adjust to open conditions and work towards their resettlement back in the community. (S40)

## Main recommendation

To HM Prison and Probation Service

- 5.2** Men being transferred to open conditions should have enough time left to serve in custody to enable them to benefit from ROTL. (S41)

## Recommendations

To HM Prison and Probation Service

### Offender management and planning

- 5.3** The decision to move a prisoner to open conditions should be based on a current OASys risk and needs assessment document. The OASys risk management document and sentence plan should be reviewed following a prisoner's arrival in open conditions to reflect the change in their circumstances. (4.11)

## Recommendations

### Early days in custody

- 5.4** Prisoners who are not fluent in English should receive an appropriate induction. Professional interpretation should be used for all confidential interactions with these prisoners. (1.13)
- 5.5** Processes should be developed to ensure the well-being of new prisoners is properly assessed and their safety on their first night assured. (1.14)

### Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.6** Safer custody processes should ensure incidents of bullying and low-level antisocial behaviour are investigated and men who are struggling to cope in open conditions identified. Action should be taken against perpetrators, and support provided to victims of bullying. (1.21)

### Self-harm and suicide

- 5.7** All discipline staff should have immediate access to anti-ligature knives. (1.27)
- 5.8** Listeners should be available at night and throughout the working day. (1.28)

### Security

- 5.9** Prisoners should only be strip-searched on the basis of intelligence or a specific suspicion. Authorisation should be recorded, along with an outline of the reasons for the search. (1.37)
- 5.10** Intelligence-led drug tests and room searches should be completed promptly and within the required timeframes. (1.38)

### Discipline

- 5.11** Adjudication data should be monitored routinely and cover all protected characteristics to ensure emerging trends are identified and acted on if necessary. (1.44)
- 5.12** Prisoners segregated for longer periods should be offered daily exercise in the open air. (1.51)
- 5.13** Segregation paperwork should be completed accurately and in full. It should justify in detail why segregation is necessary. (1.52)
- 5.14** Managers should record and analyse data on the use of the segregation unit, including the reasons why men are segregated and how long they are held there. (1.53)

### Residential units

- 5.15** Prisoners should be able to store valuables and medication securely. (2.6, repeated recommendation 2.9)
- 5.16** All showers and toilets should be clean and in a good state of repair. (2.7)

### Equality and diversity

- 5.17** Men from all protected characteristic groups should be consulted and data should be monitored systematically and used to inform a meaningful action plan. (2.18)
- 5.18** The purpose of and allocation criteria for West 7 unit should be clarified. Peer support for men with disabilities should be formally implemented and appropriately supervised. (2.27)

### Health services

- 5.19** Prisoners should be able to raise complaints and concerns through a clear and well understood system. (2.48)
- 5.20** Prison staff should have easy access to regularly checked and well-maintained automated external defibrillators. (2.49)
- 5.21** Prisoners should receive all primary care services within community-equivalent waiting times. (2.57)

- 5.22** Controlled drugs should be stored and recorded in accordance with current guidance and legislation. (2.65)
- 5.23** Nurses should be able to administer a clinically appropriate range of over-the-counter medicines without a prescription. (2.66)
- 5.24** Prisoners requiring routine dental assessments should be seen within six weeks. (2.69)
- 5.25** Prison staff should have regular mental health awareness training. (2.75)
- 5.26** Prisoners should have timely access to a community-equivalent range of mental health services, including psychological interventions and counselling. (2.76)

### Catering

- 5.27** Prisoners should be able to self-cater. (2.84, repeated recommendation 2.125)

### Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.28** The Offenders' Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) and prison provision should be subject to appropriate quality assurance arrangements. (3.7)
- 5.29** Prisoners' understanding of career progression routes should be improved and tailored to support the men's successful resettlement. (3.8)
- 5.30** Prisoners with short sentences left to serve should be provided with relevant education and accredited training. (3.14)
- 5.31** Prisoners should be able to gain accredited vocational qualifications in all work activities. (3.15)
- 5.32** Peer mentors should have appropriate support and supervision and be drawn from a wide range of previous career backgrounds. (3.20)
- 5.33** All prisoners' learning should be appropriately planned and monitored, and where relevant, the employment skills they develop should be recognised and recorded. (3.21)

### Physical education and healthy living

- 5.34** Recreational gym should be scheduled so that it does not disrupt the core working day. (3.35)
- 5.35** ROTL and vocational courses should be offered to help prisoners develop their employability in PE-related areas of work. (3.36)

### Offender management and planning

- 5.36** The IRMT should provide regular oversight of high risk cases in the last few months of the prisoner's custodial sentence and the CRC should be invited to attend meetings. (4.16)
- 5.37** MAPPA management levels should be confirmed before a prisoner starts unsupervised ROTL, particularly for overnight releases, and well enough ahead of their final release to ensure comprehensive plans are developed. (4.17)

- 5.38** The ROTL board meeting should involve the offender supervisor and the prisoner so that the plan for at least his first unsupervised ROTL experience can be explored to ensure the chair of the board is satisfied that all risks have been considered and appropriately managed. (4.18)
- 5.39** Formal re-categorisation should only take place following an evidence-based decision to return a man to closed conditions indefinitely. (4.20)

### Reintegration planning

- 5.40** Prisoners being assessed for HDC should have their resettlement needs reviewed prior to their release and action should be taken to address outstanding issues. (4.27)
- 5.41** The prison should exploit in full the potential offered by the virtual campus. (4.37)
- 5.42** Where practical, the prison should accredit the work skills achieved by men undertaking ROTL. (4.38)
- 5.43** Men who require it should have access to training on naloxone and be given a supply on release. (4.41)
- 5.44** The waiting arrangements for visitors should be improved. (4.50)
- 5.45** Access to offending behaviour work should be reviewed and appropriate action taken to ensure all prisoners' needs are addressed while they are in open conditions. (4.55)
- 5.46** Support for victims of domestic violence or those involved as sex workers in the community should be reviewed and more proactive help provided. (4.57)

### Examples of good practice

- 5.47** The provision of drug and alcohol harm reduction information to all new arrivals had raised prisoners' awareness of the dangers associated with substance misuse. (1.61)
- 5.48** A high level of social worker resource and effective partnership-working between social workers, health providers and the prison meant those with social care needs received an exemplary service. (2.78)
- 5.49** Men had the opportunity to take responsibility for planning and organising family visits, which allowed them to spend quality time with their children. The process emphasised the importance of family ties and men taking more responsibility for parenting. (4.51)



## Section 6. Appendices

### Appendix I: Inspection team

Sean Sullivan	Team leader
Colin Carroll	Inspector
Francesca Cooney	Inspector
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Deri Hughes-Roberts	Inspector
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Jonathan Tickner	Inspector
Caroline Wright	Inspector
Ellis Cowling	Researcher
Laura Green	Researcher
Helen Ranns	Researcher
Patricia Taflan	Researcher
Majella Pearce	Health services inspector
Jo MacDonald	Care Quality Commission inspector
Nigel Bragg	Ofsted inspector
Keith Hughes	Ofsted inspector
Stephen Oliver-Watts	Ofsted inspector
Martyn Griffith	Offender management inspector



## Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

### Safety

#### **Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.**

*At the last inspection, in 2013, we found that reception and induction processes had improved but there was scope for further improvement. There were few violent incidents but more prisoners than in comparable establishments reported intimidation by other prisoners and staff. The management of prisoners at risk of self-harm was mostly good. A Listener scheme had been introduced and operated well. Security arrangements were proportionate and well implemented, with effective drug supply reduction measures. Adjudication procedures were good. The level of use of force was low but higher than at comparable prisons. Segregation was used indiscriminately, without proper oversight. Substance misuse services were good. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

#### **Main recommendation**

Prisoners should only be segregated when there are compelling reasons to do so. Segregation should be properly recorded and authorised following an assessment of suitability. Conditions and the regime in segregation should meet reasonable standards and reintegration should be carefully planned. (S55)

**Partially achieved**

#### **Recommendations**

Prisoners should not be kept on vehicles for long periods once the escort arrives at the prison. (1.5)

**Achieved**

Prisoners should not be handcuffed on transfer to open conditions. (1.6)

**Achieved**

All information should be provided in an appropriate range of languages. (1.16)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners should be received by staff onto the induction wing, given appropriate information and interviewed privately to assess immediate needs, including reference to the cell sharing risk assessment. (1.17)

**Achieved**

The prison should explore and address prisoner perceptions about safety. (1.24)

**Partially achieved**

The patterns and trends of bullying and intimidation in the establishment should be analysed and action taken to reduce its incidence. (1.25)

**Not achieved**

Night staff should be appropriately trained in first-aid procedures. (1.31)

**Partially achieved**

All discipline staff should carry anti-ligature knives. (1.32)

**Not achieved**

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. (1.36)

**Partially achieved**

Prisoners should not be put on release on temporary licence holds when positive drug test results are due to prescribed medication. (1.47)

**Achieved**

Prisoners who could be the victims of bullying should be referred to the safer custody team for support and for an investigation to be carried out. (1.63)

**Partially achieved**

A comprehensive needs-analysis should be conducted to ensure that the psychosocial services currently delivered meet the needs of the population. (1.72)

**Achieved**

## Respect

**Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.**

*At the last inspection, in 2013, we found that residential units were old and worn but mostly clean. Other facilities were adequate. There were some disrespectful and unhelpful officers but most prisoners told us there were some helpful staff and there were good consultation procedures. The management of diversity was underdeveloped. The complaints system was adequate but too many prisoners did not have confidence in it. Health services had improved but governance in some areas was weak. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

### Recommendations

External areas should be maintained to an acceptable standard. (2.8)

**Achieved**

Prisoners should be able to store valuables and medication securely. (2.9)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.6)

All showers should be cleaned to a good standard every day. (2.10)

**Not achieved**

Personal officers should introduce themselves to those on their caseload within the two days outlined in the local policy, and sooner where possible. This introduction should explain what the personal officer relationship will deliver. (2.18)

**Not achieved**

The poor perceptions of prisoners about their treatment by staff should be investigated and action taken on the findings. (2.19)

**Not achieved**

The equality policy should be based on a population needs analysis. (2.29)

**Partially achieved**

Senior managers should investigate and address the allegations of victimisation by some prisoner groups identified by our survey. (2.30)

**Not achieved**

Discrimination incident report forms should be investigated within a reasonable timescale, prisoners should be informed of outcomes in writing, and external quality assurance procedures should be introduced. (2.31)

**Achieved**

A whole-prison approach should be adopted towards the promotion of diversity and all core functions should be represented at equality action team meetings. (2.32)

**Partially achieved**

Prisoners with protected characteristics should be given the opportunity to raise and discuss issues in dedicated forums. (2.43)

**Partially achieved**

Comprehensive personal emergency evacuation plans should be provided for those who need them, and a range of appropriate activities introduced for older prisoners and those with disabilities. (2.44)

**Partially achieved**

A formal and paid carers scheme should be introduced. (2.45)

**Not achieved**

The washing facilities in the multi-faith room should meet the needs of prisoners preparing to worship. (2.52)

**Achieved**

Prisoner concerns about the complaints process (including access to the Independent Monitoring Board), especially about the risk of victimisation and complaints about staff, should be investigated and addressed. (2.59)

**Partially achieved**

Senior managers should undertake complaint analysis and take remedial action in response to emerging trends. (2.60)

**Achieved**

Legal visits should take place in sufficient privacy. (2.65)

**Achieved**

There should be an up-to-date health needs assessment to enable services, including mental health services, to be mapped against need. (2.78)

**Achieved**

The complaints system should preserve medical confidentiality and responses should address all the issues raised. (2.79)

**Achieved**

Staff should have access to a full range of current policies that are relevant to the environment and are regularly reviewed. (2.80)

**Achieved**

There should be systematic health promotion throughout the prison that meets the current health promotion plan. (2.81)

**Partially achieved**

All prisoners should receive a secondary health assessment within 72 hours of arrival. (2.90)

**Partially achieved**

Triage protocols should be used by trained nurses to appoint patients to clinics and ensure consistent and effective use of consultation time. (2.91)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners should have timely access to external hospital appointments. (2.92)

**Achieved**

A medicines management committee should meet monthly, attended by all relevant stakeholders, and discuss all key elements of medicines management, including adverse incidents and aggregated prescribing data. (2.101)

**Achieved**

A full suite of standard procedures and policies for pharmacy provision and medication management, which reflect regulatory and professional requirements, should be agreed and regularly reviewed through the medicines management committee. (2.102)

**Achieved**

Medication administration records should be complete and patients who fail to collect their medicines and/or do not comply with dosing regimes should be identified, monitored and supported. (2.103)

**Achieved**

Risk assessments for in-possession medication should be carried out for all patients. (2.104)

**Partially achieved**

Patient group directions should be introduced to enable the supply of more potent medication by the pharmacist and/or nurse to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. A copy of the original signed patient group directions should be held in the pharmacy and read and signed by all relevant staff. (2.105)

**Not achieved**

Dental waiting lists should be monitored and remedial action taken to ensure that prisoners have timely access to dental services. (2.111)

**Partially achieved**

Primary mental services should include timely access to counselling and appropriate support, with regular reviews and evidence-based care from staff that are appropriately trained and supervised. (2.117)

**Partially achieved**

Breakfast should be served on the day it is to be eaten and be of sufficient quantity. (2.122)

**Partially achieved**

Staff should be supported to recognise bullying behaviour in the meal queues and challenge it. (2.123)

**No longer relevant**

All prisoners should have access to a hot meal every day. (2.124)

**Achieved**

Prisoners should be able to self-cater. (2.125)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.84)

There should be establishment-wide consultation, including black and minority ethnic groups, about the prison shop. (2.129)

**Partially achieved**

Arrangements should be made for prisoners who arrive at the establishment after prison shop order sheets have been submitted. (2.130)

**Achieved**

## Purposeful activity

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

*At the last inspection, in 2013, we found that time out of cell was good. Learning and skills provision was suitably focused on developing vocational training but there was no coherent strategy to support resettlement. There were sufficient activity places in the prison and in the community, and the quality of provision was mostly good. Insufficient use was made of education courses, and opportunities to record achievement or provide qualifications in work were not fully utilised. Library and gym provision were mostly good. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendation

Work done by prisoners on-site and in the community should be allocated to match their prospects of employment on release, opportunities to gain qualifications in work should be increased and all achievements of skills should be recorded and fed back. (S56)

**Partially achieved**

### Recommendations

There should be more association areas, equipped with association equipment. (3.3)

**Not achieved**

All staff involved in learning and skills and work activities should have opportunities to share ideas and good practice. (3.10)

**Achieved**

Prisoners should have opportunities for gaining accredited vocational qualifications in all work activities. (3.14)

**Achieved**

Prisoners with low levels of English and mathematics should attend courses to develop these skills. (3.15)

**Achieved**

English and mathematics should be set in meaningful contexts related to resettlement, including work-related or vocational settings. (3.18)

**Achieved**

Achievement of qualifications in English and mathematics should be improved, especially at levels 1 and 2. (3.23)

**Partially achieved**

Prisoners should be offered vocational PE qualifications that would enhance their chances of employment or self-employment on release. (3.33)

**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 2013, the strategic management of resettlement was poor. There was inadequate offender management and the department struggled to provide risk assessments for temporary release. There were weaknesses in public protection procedures. Provision for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners was underdeveloped. Reintegration planning was inadequate and there was poor provision of support for accommodation and financial needs. Support for prisoners to progress to education, employment or training on release was not well planned. Continuity of health care on release was well organised and substance misuse arrangements on release were mostly good. Visits facilities met the needs of prisoners and families. The facility for prisoners to attend programmes in the community had been lost. Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendations

Assessment and planning for prisoners should be reviewed on their arrival at the prison and kept up to date. Offender supervisors should be more accessible and maintain regular contact with prisoners to ensure good communication and progression of the sentence plan. (S57)

**Achieved**

There should be an appropriate focus on meeting the resettlement needs of all prisoners. The needs of the population and of individuals should be assessed regularly. Effective services should be developed and should engage with those identified as requiring them at the appropriate time. (S58)

**Achieved**

### Recommendations

The strategic management of resettlement should be improved, including the development of a more comprehensive reducing reoffending strategy and plan, overseen by a focused committee, and more coordinated working with appropriately trained staff. (4.6)

**Achieved**

A needs analysis should be undertaken to assess the resettlement needs of all categories of prisoner represented in the prison population. (4.7)

**Partially achieved**

P-Nomis should be used to record contact between offender supervisors and prisoners. (4.14)

**Achieved**

Prisoners serving less than 12 months should have a custody plan which addresses their resettlement needs. (4.15)

**Achieved**



Public protection arrangements should be reviewed and more robust processes developed to ensure that all necessary actions are identified and taken. (4.24)

**Partially achieved**

The quality of analysis in release on temporary licence (ROTL) risk assessments should be improved and include the views of offender managers and multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) participants where relevant, about the risks associated with day release. (4.25)

**Achieved**

The ROTL board should be adequately resourced to manage the high number of risk assessments. Prisoners should be kept informed about progress with their application. (4.26)

**Not achieved**

A clear policy for re-categorisation should be developed and consistently applied. (4.30)

**Partially achieved**

The needs of indeterminate-sentenced prisoners should be analysed and specific provision developed accordingly. (4.34)

**Not achieved**

Links with housing agencies should be developed and resources made available to enable appropriate levels of access to them. (4.38)

**Achieved**

The National Careers Service should be adequately staffed and its interventions timely so that they support prisoners in planning their learning and skills and work activities in preparation for release. (4.42)

**Achieved**

Work activities on release should be planned more effectively, and procedures for collecting accurate data on prisoners' progression to employment and training on release should be improved. (4.43)

**Achieved**

Prisoners should have up-to-date information on job vacancies local to their accommodation on release and have access to the facilities they need to apply for these jobs promptly and to attend interviews. (4.44)

**Achieved**

The end of life pathway should be updated so that prisoners receive appropriate palliative care. (4.48)

**Achieved**

Prisoners should be able to get advice and support with financial problems from specialist providers in the prison. (4.52)

**Achieved**

All prisoners should be able to open bank accounts. (4.53)

**Achieved**



## Appendix III: Prison population profile

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

### Population breakdown by:

Status	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Civil prisoners	0	0	0
Convicted unsentenced	0	0	0
Detainee	0	0	0
Indeterminate Sentence	0	69	12
Recall	0	5	0.9
Remand	0	0	0
Sentenced	9	490	87.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>564</b>	<b>100%</b>

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	0	0	0
Less than 6 months	0	2	0.3
6 months to less than 1 year	0	4	0.7
1 year to less than 2 years	0	12	2.1
2 years to less than 3 years	0	35	6.1
3 years to less than 4 years	1	81	14.3
4 years to less than 10 years	8	315	56.4
10 years or more and less than life	0	41	7.2
Life – Non ISPP	0	33	12.9
Life – ISPP	0	41	7.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>564</b>	<b>100%</b>

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Under 21 years	9	1.6%
21 years to 29 years	161	28.1%
30 years to 39 years	227	39.6%
40 years to 49 years	102	17.8%
50 years to 59 years	55	9.6%
60 years to 69 years	17	3.0%
70 plus years: <i>maximum age=78</i>	2	0.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>573</b>	<b>100%</b>

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	9	558	99.0%
Foreign nationals	0	6	1.0%
Not stated	0	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>564</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Category C	0	2	0.3%
Category D	5	562	99.0%
YOI open	4	0	0.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>564</b>	<b>100%</b>

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	5	319	56.5%
Irish	0	7	1.2%
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	0	5	0.9%
Other white	0	10	1.7%
	<b>5</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>60.4%</b>
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	2	23	4.4%
White and black African	0	2	0.3%
White and Asian	0	4	0.7%
Other mixed	0	3	0.5%
	2	32	5.9%
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	0	42	7.3%
Pakistani	0	45	7.9%
Bangladeshi	1	4	0.9%
Chinese	0	0	0
Other Asian	0	15	2.6%
	1	106	18.75%
Black or black British			
Caribbean	1	62	11%
African	0	10	1.7%
Other black	0	10	1.7%
	1	82	14.5%
Other ethnic group			
Arab	0	1	0.2%
Other ethnic group	0	1	0.2%
	0	2	0.3%
Not stated			
Prefer not to say	0	1	0.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>564</b>	<b>100%</b>

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Buddhist	0	6	1.0%
Church of England	2	88	15.7%
Hindu	0	6	1.0%
Jewish	0	0	0.0%
Muslim	1	112	19.7%
No religion	2	179	31.6%
Not stated	0	0	0.0%
Other	1	14	2.6%
Other Christian denominations	2	61	11.0%
Roman Catholic	1	75	11.3%
Sikh	0	23	4.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>564</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Sentenced prisoners only**

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	3	0.5%	85	14.8%
1 month to 3 months	4	0.7%	129	22.5%
6 months to 1 year	0	0.0%	158	27.6%
1 year to 2 years	1	0.2%	73	12.7%
2 years to 4 years	0	0.0%	2	0.3%
3 months to 6 months	1	0.2%	115	20.1%
4 years or more	0	0.0%	2	0.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>564</b>	<b>98.4%</b>

**Sentenced prisoners only**

		%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	0	0.0%
Public protection cases (MAPPA prisoners)	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

**Unsentenced prisoners only**

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0	0	0
1 month to 3 months	0	0	0	0
3 months to six months	0	0	0	0
six months to 1 year	0	0	0	0
1 year to 2 years	0	0	0	0
2 years to 4 years	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>



## Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

### Prisoner survey methodology

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

### Sampling

The prisoner survey was conducted on a representative sample of the prison population. Using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician we calculated the sample size required to ensure that our survey findings reflected the experiences of the entire population of the establishment<sup>7</sup>. Respondents were then randomly selected from a P-NOMIS prisoner population printout using a systematic sampling method.

### Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

### Survey response

At the time of the survey on 10 April 2017 the prisoner population at HMP & YOI Sudbury was 574. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 228 prisoners.

We received a total of 188 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 82%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Nine respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and 31 questionnaires were not returned.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
E	77
P	47
W	64

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

## Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP & YOI Sudbury.

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<sup>8</sup> 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 & YOI Sudbury in 2017 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 14 open prisons since April 2013.
- The current survey responses from HMP & YOI Sudbury in 2017 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Sudbury in 2013.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of prisoners on P wing and those on E and W wings.

---

<sup>8</sup> A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.01 which means that there is only a 1% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.



## Survey summary

### Section I: About You

<b>Q1.1</b>	<b>What wing or houseblock are you currently living on?</b> See survey methodology.	
<b>Q1.2</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	Under 21 .....	3 (2%)
	21 - 29 .....	39 (21%)
	30 - 39 .....	80 (44%)
	40 - 49 .....	33 (18%)
	50 - 59 .....	19 (10%)
	60 - 69 .....	7 (4%)
	70 and over .....	2 (1%)
<b>Q1.3</b>	<b>Are you on recall?</b>	
	Yes .....	1 (1%)
	No .....	176 (99%)
<b>Q1.4</b>	<b>How long is your sentence?</b>	
	Less than 6 months .....	2 (1%)
	6 months to less than 1 year .....	3 (2%)
	1 year to less than 2 years .....	7 (4%)
	2 years to less than 4 years .....	50 (27%)
	4 years to less than 10 years .....	87 (48%)
	10 years or more .....	13 (7%)
	IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection) .....	11 (6%)
	Life .....	9 (5%)
<b>Q1.5</b>	<b>Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?</b>	
	Yes .....	4 (2%)
	No .....	180 (98%)
<b>Q1.6</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>	
	Yes .....	181 (99%)
	No .....	2 (1%)
<b>Q1.7</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>	
	Yes .....	183 (99%)
	No .....	2 (1%)
<b>Q1.8</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>	
	White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish) .....	110 (61%)
	White - Irish .....	0 (0%)
	White - other .....	1 (1%)
	Black or black British - Caribbean .....	17 (9%)
	Black or black British - African .....	3 (2%)
	Black or black British - other .....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian .....	11 (6%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani .....	18 (10%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi .....	2 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Chinese .....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - other .....	5 (3%)
	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean .....	7 (4%)
	Mixed race - white and black African .....	1 (1%)
	Mixed race - white and Asian .....	2 (1%)
	Mixed race - other .....	0 (0%)
	Arab .....	0 (0%)
	Other ethnic group .....	3 (2%)

<b>Q1.9</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?</b>		
	Yes .....		6 (3%)
	No.....		172 (97%)
<b>Q1.10</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>		
	None.....	49 (27%)	Hindu..... 2 (1%)
	Church of England .....	50 (27%)	Jewish..... 0 (0%)
	Catholic .....	24 (13%)	Muslim..... 33 (18%)
	Protestant.....	2 (1%)	Sikh .....
	Other Christian denomination .....	7 (4%)	Other .....
	Buddhist .....	2 (1%)	7 (4%)
<b>Q1.11</b>	<b>How would you describe your sexual orientation?</b>		
	Heterosexual/ Straight .....		178 (97%)
	Homosexual/Gay.....		3 (2%)
	Bisexual.....		2 (1%)
<b>Q1.12</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)?</b>		
	Yes .....		19 (10%)
	No.....		166 (90%)
<b>Q1.13</b>	<b>Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?</b>		
	Yes .....		9 (5%)
	No.....		178 (95%)
<b>Q1.14</b>	<b>Is this your first time in prison?</b>		
	Yes .....		103 (55%)
	No.....		83 (45%)
<b>Q1.15</b>	<b>Do you have children under the age of 18?</b>		
	Yes .....		119 (64%)
	No.....		66 (36%)

## Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

<b>Q2.1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>		
	Less than 2 hours .....		130 (70%)
	2 hours or longer .....		50 (27%)
	Don't remember.....		7 (4%)
<b>Q2.2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>		
	My journey was less than two hours.....		130 (70%)
	Yes .....		50 (27%)
	No.....		3 (2%)
	Don't remember.....		2 (1%)
<b>Q2.3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>		
	My journey was less than two hours.....		130 (70%)
	Yes .....		3 (2%)
	No.....		53 (28%)
	Don't remember.....		1 (1%)

<b>Q2.4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>	
	Yes .....	115 (62%)
	No.....	58 (31%)
	Don't remember.....	13 (7%)
<b>Q2.5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes .....	154 (83%)
	No.....	26 (14%)
	Don't remember.....	5 (3%)
<b>Q2.6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	Very well.....	64 (34%)
	Well.....	85 (45%)
	Neither.....	31 (17%)
	Badly.....	3 (2%)
	Very badly .....	1 (1%)
	Don't remember.....	3 (2%)
<b>Q2.7</b>	<b>Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Yes, someone told me .....	143 (76%)
	Yes, I received written information.....	27 (14%)
	No, I was not told anything.....	19 (10%)
	Don't remember.....	2 (1%)
<b>Q2.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?</b>	
	Yes .....	163 (87%)
	No.....	23 (12%)
	Don't remember.....	1 (1%)

### Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

<b>Q3.1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	Less than 2 hours .....	111 (60%)
	2 hours or longer .....	67 (36%)
	Don't remember.....	6 (3%)
<b>Q3.2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	Yes .....	147 (82%)
	No .....	18 (10%)
	Don't remember.....	15 (8%)
<b>Q3.3</b>	<b>Overall, how were you treated in reception?</b>	
	Very well.....	50 (27%)
	Well.....	94 (51%)
	Neither.....	28 (15%)
	Badly.....	8 (4%)
	Very badly .....	6 (3%)
	Don't remember.....	0 (0%)

<b>Q3.4</b>	<b>Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>Loss of property</i> .....	18 (10%)	<i>Physical health</i> ..... 16 (9%)
	<i>Housing problems</i> .....	13 (7%)	<i>Mental health</i> ..... 20 (11%)
	<i>Contacting employers</i> .....	4 (2%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Contacting family</i> .....	18 (10%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> ..... 12 (7%)
	<i>Childcare</i> .....	1 (1%)	<i>Other</i> .....
	<i>Money worries</i> .....	21 (12%)	<i>Did not have any problems</i> ..... 109 (61%)
	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i> .....	14 (8%)	
<b>Q3.5</b>	<b>Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?</b>		
	Yes .....		29 (16%)
	No.....		44 (24%)
	<i>Did not have any problems</i> .....		109 (60%)
<b>Q3.6</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>Tobacco</i> .....		63 (35%)
	<i>A shower</i> .....		62 (34%)
	<i>A free telephone call</i> .....		75 (41%)
	<i>Something to eat</i> .....		104 (57%)
	<i>PIN phone credit</i> .....		61 (34%)
	<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i> .....		72 (40%)
	<i>Did not receive anything</i> .....		37 (20%)
<b>Q3.7</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>Chaplain</i> .....		103 (57%)
	<i>Someone from health services</i> .....		117 (65%)
	<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i> .....		52 (29%)
	<i>Prison shop/ canteen</i> .....		53 (29%)
	<i>Did not have access to any of these</i> .....		40 (22%)
<b>Q3.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>What was going to happen to you</i> .....		91 (51%)
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i> .....		71 (40%)
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i> .....		90 (51%)
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i> .....		82 (46%)
	<i>Health services</i> .....		101 (57%)
	<i>Chaplaincy</i> .....		88 (49%)
	<i>Not offered any information</i> .....		49 (28%)
<b>Q3.9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night here?</b>		
	Yes .....		164 (89%)
	No.....		14 (8%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....		6 (3%)
<b>Q3.10</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?</b>		
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i> .....		7 (4%)
	<i>Within the first week</i> .....		165 (89%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....		9 (5%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....		4 (2%)

<b>Q3.11</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?</b>	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i> .....	7 (4%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	111 (60%)
	<i>No</i> .....	60 (32%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	7 (4%)
<b>Q3.12</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?</b>	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i> .....	46 (25%)
	<i>Within the first week</i> .....	52 (28%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	55 (30%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	30 (16%)

#### Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

<b>Q4.1</b>	<b>How easy is it to.....</b>						
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>N/A</i>
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	38 (21%)	36 (20%)	28 (16%)	18 (10%)	14 (8%)	45 (25%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	15 (10%)	28 (18%)	27 (18%)	14 (9%)	7 (5%)	62 (41%)
<b>Q4.2</b>	<b>Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?</b>						
	<i>Not had any letters</i> .....						70 (38%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....						41 (22%)
	<i>No</i> .....						72 (39%)
<b>Q4.3</b>	<b>Can you get legal books in the library?</b>						
	<i>Yes</i> .....						90 (50%)
	<i>No</i> .....						6 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....						83 (46%)
<b>Q4.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:</b>						
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>			
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	169 (92%)	15 (8%)	0 (0%)			
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	102 (57%)	58 (32%)	19 (11%)			
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	81 (45%)	90 (50%)	9 (5%)			
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	131 (73%)	47 (26%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	81 (47%)	43 (25%)	48 (28%)			
<b>Q4.5</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>						
	<i>Very good</i> .....						11 (6%)
	<i>Good</i> .....						67 (36%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....						55 (30%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....						33 (18%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....						19 (10%)
<b>Q4.6</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?</b>						
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i> .....						3 (2%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....						138 (75%)
	<i>No</i> .....						43 (23%)
<b>Q4.7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?</b>						
	<i>Yes</i> .....						77 (42%)
	<i>No</i> .....						14 (8%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....						93 (51%)

<b>Q4.8</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>	
	Yes .....	111 (61%)
	No.....	12 (7%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	58 (32%)
<b>Q4.9</b>	<b>Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes .....	122 (67%)
	No.....	4 (2%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	57 (31%)
<b>Q4.10</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?</b>	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i> .....	31 (17%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	86 (47%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	36 (20%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	7 (4%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	22 (12%)

### Section 5: Applications and complaints

<b>Q5.1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>			
	Yes .....	152 (83%)		
	No .....	15 (8%)		
	Don't know .....	17 (9%)		
<b>Q5.2</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about applications. (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</b>			
		<i>Not made one</i>		
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with fairly?	35 (19%)	93 (52%)	52 (29%)
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	35 (20%)	88 (51%)	51 (29%)
<b>Q5.3</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>			
	Yes .....	78 (44%)		
	No .....	30 (17%)		
	Don't know .....	71 (40%)		
<b>Q5.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about complaints. (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)</b>			
		<i>Not made one</i>		
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with fairly?	108 (60%)	23 (13%)	50 (28%)
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	108 (62%)	31 (18%)	36 (21%)
<b>Q5.5</b>	<b>Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?</b>			
	Yes .....	35 (21%)		
	No.....	133 (79%)		

<b>Q5.6</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?</b>	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i> .....	74 (42%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	19 (11%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	27 (15%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	33 (19%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	15 (8%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	10 (6%)

### Section 6: Relationships with staff

<b>Q6.1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	122 (67%)
	<i>No</i> .....	61 (33%)
<b>Q6.2</b>	<b>Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	113 (63%)
	<i>No</i> .....	66 (37%)
<b>Q6.3</b>	<b>Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	31 (17%)
	<i>No</i> .....	154 (83%)
<b>Q6.4</b>	<b>How often do staff normally speak to you during association?</b>	
	<i>Do not go on association</i> .....	19 (10%)
	<i>Never</i> .....	73 (40%)
	<i>Rarely</i> .....	39 (22%)
	<i>Some of the time</i> .....	36 (20%)
	<i>Most of the time</i> .....	10 (6%)
	<i>All of the time</i> .....	4 (2%)
<b>Q6.5</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i> .....	63 (34%)
	<i>In the first week</i> .....	43 (23%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	62 (34%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	15 (8%)
<b>Q6.6</b>	<b>How helpful is your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i> .....	63 (35%)
	<i>Very helpful</i> .....	41 (23%)
	<i>Helpful</i> .....	28 (15%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	20 (11%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i> .....	17 (9%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i> .....	12 (7%)

### Section 7: Safety

<b>Q7.1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	37 (20%)
	<i>No</i> .....	148 (80%)
<b>Q7.2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	14 (8%)
	<i>No</i> .....	170 (92%)

<b>Q7.3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Never felt unsafe .....	148 (83%)
	Everywhere .....	7 (4%)
	Association areas .....	10 (6%)
	Reception area .....	2 (1%)
	At the gym .....	4 (2%)
	In an exercise yard .....	3 (2%)
	At work.....	10 (6%)
	During movement .....	5 (3%)
	At education .....	2 (1%)
	At meal times .....	10 (6%)
	At health services .....	4 (2%)
	Visits area.....	2 (1%)
	In wing showers.....	5 (3%)
	In gym showers.....	3 (2%)
	In corridors/stairwells .....	8 (4%)
	On your landing/wing.....	10 (6%)
	In your cell.....	10 (6%)
	At religious services .....	2 (1%)
<b>Q7.4</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?</b>	
	Yes .....	26 (14%)
	No.....	159 (86%)
<b>Q7.5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends) .....	12 (6%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) .....	3 (2%)
	Sexual abuse .....	0 (0%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated .....	15 (8%)
	Having your canteen/property taken.....	2 (1%)
	Medication.....	3 (2%)
	Debt .....	1 (1%)
	Drugs.....	2 (1%)
	Your race or ethnic origin.....	4 (2%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs .....	3 (2%)
	Your nationality .....	5 (3%)
	You're from a different part of the country than others .....	2 (1%)
	You are from a traveller community .....	1 (1%)
	Your sexual orientation .....	2 (1%)
	Your age.....	5 (3%)
	You have a disability.....	1 (1%)
	You were new here.....	8 (4%)
	Your offence/ crime .....	0 (0%)
	Gang related issues.....	2 (1%)
<b>Q7.6</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by staff here?</b>	
	Yes .....	38 (22%)
	No.....	138 (78%)



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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i> .....	15 (9%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	16 (9%)
<i>Medication</i> .....	2 (1%)
<i>Debt</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Drugs</i> .....	2 (1%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	4 (2%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....	3 (2%)
<i>Your nationality</i> .....	3 (2%)
<i>You're from a different part of the country than others</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>Your age</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>You have a disability</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>You were new here</i> .....	7 (4%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i> .....	2 (1%)
<i>Gang related issues</i> .....	0 (0%)

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

<i>Not been victimised</i> .....	124 (74%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	11 (7%)
<i>No</i> .....	33 (20%)

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

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	25 (14%)	10 (6%)	40 (22%)	24 (13%)	55 (31%)	25 (14%)
The nurse	21 (12%)	26 (15%)	67 (38%)	24 (13%)	29 (16%)	11 (6%)
The dentist	41 (23%)	8 (4%)	21 (12%)	20 (11%)	43 (24%)	45 (25%)

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

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	28 (15%)	26 (14%)	46 (25%)	29 (16%)	31 (17%)	23 (13%)
The nurse	20 (11%)	25 (14%)	58 (32%)	28 (16%)	23 (13%)	25 (14%)
The dentist	53 (31%)	24 (14%)	38 (22%)	29 (17%)	15 (9%)	14 (8%)

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

<i>Not been</i> .....	14 (8%)
<i>Very good</i> .....	10 (6%)
<i>Good</i> .....	63 (35%)
<i>Neither</i> .....	27 (15%)
<i>Bad</i> .....	34 (19%)
<i>Very bad</i> .....	31 (17%)

**Q8.4 Are you currently taking medication?**

<i>Yes</i> .....	82 (45%)
<i>No</i> .....	101 (55%)

<b>Q8.5</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your own cell?</b>	
	<i>Not taking medication</i> .....	101 (55%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i> .....	67 (37%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i> .....	10 (5%)
	<i>No</i> .....	5 (3%)

<b>Q8.6</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	30 (16%)
	<i>No</i> .....	152 (84%)

<b>Q8.7</b>	<b>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)?</b>	
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i> .....	152 (85%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	12 (7%)
	<i>No</i> .....	14 (8%)

### Section 9: Drugs and alcohol

<b>Q9.1</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	19 (10%)
	<i>No</i> .....	163 (90%)

<b>Q9.2</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	15 (8%)
	<i>No</i> .....	167 (92%)

<b>Q9.3</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	42 (23%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	30 (17%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	8 (4%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	94 (52%)

<b>Q9.4</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	32 (18%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	29 (16%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	10 (6%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	7 (4%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	100 (56%)

<b>Q9.5</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	4 (2%)
	<i>No</i> .....	176 (98%)

<b>Q9.6</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	4 (2%)
	<i>No</i> .....	177 (98%)

<b>Q9.7</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i> .....	154 (89%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	19 (11%)
	<i>No</i> .....	1 (1%)

<b>Q9.8</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i> .....	167 (93%)
	Yes.....	12 (7%)
	No.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q9.9</b>	<b>Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?</b>	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i> .....	149 (86%)
	Yes.....	23 (13%)
	No.....	2 (1%)

### Section 10: Activities

<b>Q10.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?</b>						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	11 (6%)	52 (30%)	67 (38%)	24 (14%)	14 (8%)	8 (5%)
	Vocational or skills training	30 (17%)	28 (16%)	60 (34%)	31 (18%)	19 (11%)	7 (4%)
	Education (including basic skills)	22 (13%)	35 (20%)	78 (45%)	21 (12%)	14 (8%)	5 (3%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	71 (42%)	15 (9%)	35 (21%)	30 (18%)	11 (6%)	8 (5%)
<b>Q10.2</b>	<b>Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i> .....						25 (15%)
	Prison job.....						131 (78%)
	Vocational or skills training.....						26 (15%)
	Education (including basic skills).....						44 (26%)
	Offending behaviour programmes.....						1 (1%)
<b>Q10.3</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?</b>						
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>		
	Prison job	12 (7%)	66 (41%)	71 (44%)	12 (7%)		
	Vocational or skills training	33 (25%)	56 (43%)	27 (21%)	15 (11%)		
	Education (including basic skills)	25 (18%)	62 (45%)	38 (28%)	12 (9%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes	37 (30%)	38 (31%)	32 (26%)	17 (14%)		
<b>Q10.4</b>	<b>How often do you usually go to the library?</b>						
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....						13 (7%)
	<i>Never</i> .....						16 (9%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i> .....						35 (20%)
	<i>About once a week</i> .....						45 (25%)
	<i>More than once a week</i> .....						69 (39%)
<b>Q10.5</b>	<b>Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?</b>						
	<i>Don't use it</i> .....						26 (15%)
	Yes.....						129 (72%)
	No.....						24 (13%)
<b>Q10.6</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>						
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....						20 (11%)
	<i>0</i> .....						27 (15%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....						34 (19%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....						87 (49%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....						8 (5%)

<b>Q10.7</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	4 (2%)
	<i>0</i> .....	11 (6%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....	34 (19%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....	39 (22%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....	92 (51%)
<b>Q10.8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually have association each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	9 (5%)
	<i>0</i> .....	14 (8%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....	4 (2%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....	137 (83%)
<b>Q10.9</b>	<b>How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	4 (2%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i> .....	6 (4%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i> .....	9 (5%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i> .....	28 (16%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i> .....	28 (16%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i> .....	86 (51%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	9 (5%)

### Section 11: Contact with family and friends

<b>Q11.1</b>	<b>Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	75 (44%)
	<i>No</i> .....	97 (56%)
<b>Q11.2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	36 (20%)
	<i>No</i> .....	141 (80%)
<b>Q11.3</b>	<b>Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	34 (19%)
	<i>No</i> .....	143 (81%)
<b>Q11.4</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	14 (8%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	21 (12%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	42 (24%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	17 (10%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	46 (26%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	33 (19%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	4 (2%)

### Section 12: Preparation for release

<b>Q12.1</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	159 (90%)
	<i>No</i> .....	17 (10%)

<b>Q12.2</b>	<b>What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Do not have an offender manager/ NA</i> .....	17 (10%)
	<i>No contact</i> .....	32 (19%)
	<i>Letter</i> .....	34 (20%)
	<i>Phone</i> .....	96 (56%)
	<i>Visit</i> .....	36 (21%)
<b>Q12.3</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	168 (96%)
	<i>No</i> .....	7 (4%)
<b>Q12.4</b>	<b>Do you have a sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	145 (84%)
	<i>No</i> .....	27 (16%)
<b>Q12.5</b>	<b>How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i> .....	27 (15%)
	<i>Very involved</i> .....	57 (33%)
	<i>Involved</i> .....	64 (37%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	7 (4%)
	<i>Not very involved</i> .....	12 (7%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i> .....	8 (5%)
<b>Q12.6</b>	<b>Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i> .....	27 (16%)
	<i>Nobody</i> .....	35 (20%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i> .....	100 (58%)
	<i>Offender manager</i> .....	44 (26%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i> .....	22 (13%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i> .....	20 (12%)
<b>Q12.7</b>	<b>Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i> .....	27 (16%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	115 (67%)
	<i>No</i> .....	14 (8%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	15 (9%)
<b>Q12.8</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i> .....	27 (16%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	21 (12%)
	<i>No</i> .....	108 (63%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	15 (9%)
<b>Q12.9</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i> .....	27 (16%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	57 (34%)
	<i>No</i> .....	65 (38%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	21 (12%)
<b>Q12.10</b>	<b>Do you have a needs based custody plan?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	7 (4%)
	<i>No</i> .....	91 (53%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	73 (43%)

**Q12.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?**

Yes .....	57 (33%)
No.....	114 (67%)

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

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	57 (35%)	54 (33%)	54 (33%)
Accommodation	66 (41%)	49 (31%)	45 (28%)
Benefits	61 (39%)	48 (30%)	49 (31%)
Finances	61 (39%)	42 (27%)	55 (35%)
Education	63 (40%)	53 (34%)	41 (26%)
Drugs and alcohol	74 (49%)	45 (30%)	33 (22%)

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

	Yes	No
Resettlement day release	116 (67%)	57 (33%)
Resettlement overnight release	107 (63%)	64 (37%)

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

	Yes	No
Resettlement day release	91 (53%)	80 (47%)
Resettlement overnight release	66 (40%)	98 (60%)
Special purpose leave	40 (27%)	109 (73%)

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

	Yes	No
Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here	33 (19%)	141 (81%)
Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility, freedom etc)	44 (25%)	132 (75%)
Do you feel you have been given a greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions	126 (73%)	46 (27%)
Have you been on a preparation for release course	46 (27%)	127 (73%)
Is this prison near your home area or intended release address	77 (44%)	98 (56%)
Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that will make you less likely to offend in the future	107 (63%)	62 (37%)

## Main comparator and comparator to last time



### Prisoner survey responses HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017

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

#### Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2013
	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				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>188</b>	<b>1,953</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>154</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	2%	1%	2%	0%
1.3	Are you on recall?	1%	3%	1%	4%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	3%	2%	3%	2%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	6%	13%	6%	10%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	2%	2%	2%	2%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	100%	99%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	99%	99%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	38%	26%	38%	40%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	3%	3%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	18%	13%	18%	15%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3%	3%	3%	4%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	10%	13%	10%	7%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	5%	7%	5%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	55%	52%	55%	48%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	64%	50%	64%	58%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	27%	47%	27%	47%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	91%	83%	91%	81%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	5%	11%	5%	7%
2.4	Was the van clean?	62%	66%	62%	59%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	83%	85%	83%	80%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	80%	79%	80%	74%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	77%	78%	77%	84%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	14%	16%	14%	12%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	87%	91%	87%	90%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2013
	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				
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	60%	77%	60%	73%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	82%	87%	82%	79%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	77%	84%	77%	69%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	39%	40%	39%	54%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	10%	10%	10%	10%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	7%	8%	7%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	2%	2%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	10%	8%	10%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	0%	1%	1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	12%	9%	12%	14%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	8%	4%	8%	7%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	9%	8%	9%	11%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	11%	6%	11%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	1%	1%	1%	0%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	7%	10%	7%	23%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	40%	47%	40%	39%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	35%	58%	35%	29%
3.6	A shower?	34%	37%	34%	25%
3.6	A free telephone call?	42%	38%	42%	44%
3.6	Something to eat?	57%	50%	57%	31%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	34%	58%	34%	29%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	40%	43%	40%	21%



## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2013
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				
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>				
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7 The chaplain or a religious leader?	57%	59%	57%	48%
3.7 Someone from health services?	65%	74%	65%	67%
3.7 A Listener/Samaritans?	29%	44%	29%	28%
3.7 Prison shop/ canteen?	29%	32%	29%	18%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8 What was going to happen to you?	51%	70%	51%	60%
3.8 Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	40%	49%	40%	40%
3.8 How to make routine requests?	51%	57%	51%	52%
3.8 Your entitlement to visits?	46%	55%	46%	55%
3.8 Health services?	57%	65%	57%	64%
3.8 The chaplaincy?	49%	57%	49%	53%
3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?	89%	92%	89%	84%
3.10 Have you been on an induction course?	96%	94%	96%	100%
For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11 Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	62%	72%	62%	70%
3.12 Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	75%	88%	75%	78%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>				
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1 Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	41%	58%	41%	61%
4.1 Attend legal visits?	28%	47%	28%	46%
4.2 Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	22%	24%	22%	39%
4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?	50%	48%	50%	49%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4 Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	92%	99%	92%	97%
4.4 Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	57%	67%	57%	65%
4.4 Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	45%	65%	45%	43%
4.4 Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	73%	79%	73%	71%
4.4 Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	47%	43%	47%	47%
4.5 Is the food in this prison good/very good?	42%	40%	42%	31%
4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	75%	54%	75%	51%
4.7 Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	42%	63%	42%	49%
4.8 Are your religious beliefs respected?	61%	55%	61%	50%
4.9 Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	67%	65%	67%	67%
4.9 Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	67%	55%	67%	52%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2013	
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					
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	83%	85%	83%	86%
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	64%	70%	64%	68%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	63%	58%	63%	62%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	44%	53%	44%	47%
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	31%	39%	31%	35%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	46%	40%	46%	37%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	21%	16%	21%	22%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	26%	40%	26%	20%
<b>SECTION 6: Relationships with staff</b>					
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	67%	82%	67%	61%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	63%	80%	63%	67%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	17%	35%	17%	18%
6.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	8%	22%	8%	11%
6.5	Do you have a personal officer?	66%	76%	66%	78%
	For those with a personal officer:				
6.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	59%	74%	59%	65%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2013
	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				
<b>SECTION 7: Safety</b>					
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	20%	19%	20%	22%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	8%	7%	8%	10%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	14%	15%	14%	20%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
7.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	7%	6%	7%	6%
7.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	2%	2%	0%
7.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%	0%	0%
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	8%	8%	8%
7.5	Taken your canteen/property?	1%	1%	1%	2%
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?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	2%	2%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	2%	2%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	1%	3%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	1%	1%	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?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	1%	3%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	2%	4%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	3%	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	1%	1%	1%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2013
	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				
<b>SECTION 7: Safety continued</b>					
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	22%	20%	22%	28%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	7%	9%	8%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	0%	0%	1%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%	0%	1%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	9%	9%	13%
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	1%	1%	4%
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	3%	2%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	2%	2%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	1%	2%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	0%	1%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	3%	4%	5%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	3%	1%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%	0%	0%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
7.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	25%	28%	25%	16%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2013
	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				
<b>SECTION 8: Health services</b>					
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	28%	53%	28%	38%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	52%	73%	52%	58%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	16%	27%	16%	21%
	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?	47%	67%	47%	47%
8.2	The nurse?	52%	76%	52%	66%
8.2	The dentist?	52%	56%	52%	46%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	44%	66%	44%	51%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	45%	47%	45%	38%
	For those currently taking medication:				
8.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	94%	98%	94%	95%
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	17%	15%	17%	13%
	For those who have problems:				
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	46%	63%	46%	45%
<b>SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol</b>					
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	11%	11%	11%	11%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	8%	11%	8%	8%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	40%	37%	40%	45%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	34%	20%	34%	34%
9.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	2%	2%	2%	3%
9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	2%	2%	2%	4%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
9.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	95%	82%	95%	53%
9.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	100%	83%	100%	89%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
9.9	Was the support helpful?	92%	90%	92%	87%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2013
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				
<b>SECTION 10: Activities</b>				
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
10.1 A prison job?	68%	76%	68%	74%
10.1 Vocational or skills training?	50%	59%	50%	59%
10.1 Education (including basic skills)?	65%	73%	65%	64%
10.1 Offending Behaviour Programmes?	30%	33%	30%	31%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
10.2 A prison job?	78%	72%	78%	69%
10.2 Vocational or skills training?	15%	18%	15%	17%
10.2 Education (including basic skills)?	26%	22%	26%	19%
10.2 Offending Behaviour Programmes?	1%	5%	1%	6%
10.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	93%	94%	93%	91%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
10.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	44%	44%	44%	51%
10.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	75%	83%	75%	76%
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?	57%	63%	57%	70%
10.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	82%	85%	82%	80%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
10.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	55%	60%	55%	70%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	70%	71%	70%	63%
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?	44%	49%	44%	54%
10.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	64%	54%	64%	63%
10.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	72%	60%	72%	71%
10.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	54%	50%	54%	50%
10.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	73%	75%	73%	80%
10.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	83%	77%	83%	80%
10.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	51%	57%	51%	56%
<b>SECTION 11: Friends and family</b>				
11.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	44%	57%	44%	44%
11.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	20%	19%	20%	24%
11.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	19%	12%	19%	18%
11.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	36%	41%	36%	38%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2013
	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				
<b>SECTION 12: Preparation for release</b>					
12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	90%	94%	90%	95%
	For those who have an offender manager what type of contact have you had:				
12.2	No contact?	21%	15%	21%	21%
12.2	Contact by letter?	22%	39%	22%	38%
12.2	Contact by phone?	62%	59%	62%	57%
12.2	Contact by visit?	23%	40%	23%	41%
12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	96%	93%	96%	91%
12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	84%	82%	84%	77%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
12.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	82%	75%	82%	75%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
12.6	Nobody?	24%	26%	24%	41%
12.6	Offender supervisor?	69%	62%	69%	40%
12.6	Offender manager?	30%	43%	30%	30%
12.6	Named/ personal officer?	15%	20%	15%	17%
12.6	Staff from other departments?	14%	19%	14%	20%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	80%	77%	80%	76%
12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	15%	11%	15%	18%
12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	40%	48%	40%	55%
12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	4%	7%	4%	10%
12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	33%	37%	33%	33%
	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?	50%	54%	50%	61%
12.12	Accommodation?	52%	48%	52%	60%
12.12	Benefits?	50%	49%	50%	59%
12.12	Finances?	43%	41%	43%	50%
12.12	Education?	56%	56%	56%	53%
12.12	Drugs and alcohol?	58%	59%	58%	55%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:				
12.13	Resettlement day release?	67%	74%	67%	89%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	63%	70%	63%	88%
	Have you had access to the following:				
12.14	Resettlement day release?	53%	62%	53%	73%
12.14	Resettlement overnight release?	40%	47%	40%	68%
12.14	Special purpose leave?	27%	31%	27%	42%
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:				
12.15	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	19%	28%	19%	25%
12.15	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	25%	30%	25%	28%
12.15	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	73%	78%	73%	77%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	Open prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017	HMP & YOI Sudbury 2013
	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				
12.15	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	27%	18%	27%	22%
12.15	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	44%	47%	44%	57%
12.15	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	63%	62%	63%	63%



## Diversity analysis



### Key Question Responses (ethnicity and religion) HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017

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

#### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	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				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>69</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>151</b>
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	3%	1%	0%	3%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	97%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	99%	97%	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.)			100%	25%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	4%	3%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	47%	0%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	4%	15%	9%	11%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	8%	0%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	56%	56%	63%	53%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	74%	84%	69%	81%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	75%	77%	76%	76%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	76%	84%	65%	85%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	75%	78%	73%	78%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	40%	40%	42%	40%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	66%	64%	66%	65%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	82%	93%	85%	90%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	97%	96%	97%	96%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	46%	37%	43%	42%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	93%	92%	94%	91%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	40%	42%	40%	43%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	74%	75%	85%	72%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	34%	48%	34%	44%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	79%	50%	82%	56%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	82%	57%	88%	62%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	84%	82%	85%	82%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	41%	44%	27%	47%

## 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				
6.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	65%	67%	64%	68%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	61%	65%	50%	67%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	4%	10%	6%	8%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	73%	61%	79%	63%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	22%	20%	24%	20%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	13%	5%	12%	7%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	17%	14%	21%	13%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	7%	9%	9%	8%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	6%	0%	9%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	4%	0%	6%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	4%	2%	9%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	2%	0%	3%	0%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	32%	15%	39%	18%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	14%	7%	16%	8%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	6%	0%	6%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	5%	0%	6%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	5%	0%	6%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	27%	28%	29%	29%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	49%	54%	45%	55%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	47%	46%	40%	47%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	13%	20%	12%	18%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	35%	42%	47%	38%

## 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				
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	81%	76%	86%	76%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	12%	18%	14%	16%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	21%	29%	21%	27%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	1%	0%	1%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	68%	61%	61%	64%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	63%	49%	58%	52%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	65%	76%	64%	74%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	82%	82%	90%	81%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	43%	53%	48%	50%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	25%	17%	22%	20%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	20%	19%	23%	18%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:				
12.12	Resettlement day release?	72%	64%	80%	65%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	68%	58%	69%	62%
	Have you had access to the following:				
12.13	Resettlement day release?	57%	48%	61%	51%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	38%	39%	46%	39%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	29%	26%	25%	27%
	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?	20%	17%	23%	19%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	28%	21%	23%	25%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	68%	77%	66%	75%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	37%	20%	38%	25%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	34%	50%	26%	47%

## Diversity analysis



### Key Question Responses (disability and age over 50) HMP & YO1 Sudbury 2017

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

#### Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better					
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		19	166	28	155
1.5 Are you a foreign national?		0%	2%	0%	3%
1.6 Do you understand spoken English?		100%	99%	100%	99%
1.7 Do you understand written English?		100%	99%	100%	99%
1.8 Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)		16%	41%	25%	42%
1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		5%	3%	0%	4%
1.1 Are you Muslim?		16%	18%	7%	21%
1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?				21%	8%
1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?		5%	5%	11%	4%
1.14 Is this your first time in prison?		33%	58%	64%	56%
2.6 Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?		90%	78%	86%	80%
2.7 Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?		85%	75%	72%	77%
3.2 When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?		100%	79%	92%	79%
3.3 Were you treated well/very well in reception?		79%	77%	85%	76%
3.4 Did you have any problems when you first arrived?		77%	36%	52%	37%
3.7 Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?		67%	64%	66%	65%
3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?		79%	90%	89%	89%
3.10 Have you been on an induction course?		100%	96%	100%	96%
4.1 Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?		41%	41%	33%	43%
4.4 Are you normally able to have a shower every day?		100%	91%	97%	92%
4.5 Is the food in this prison good/very good?		31%	44%	32%	45%
4.6 Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?		89%	73%	64%	77%
4.7 Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?		69%	40%	59%	39%
4.8 Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?		62%	62%	74%	60%
4.9 Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?		67%	67%	67%	68%
5.1 Is it easy to make an application?		95%	81%	89%	82%
5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?		65%	41%	48%	43%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
6.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	64%	67%	89%	63%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	69%	63%	68%	63%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	0%	9%	18%	6%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	74%	65%	61%	67%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	31%	19%	28%	18%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	10%	8%	7%	8%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	31%	12%	25%	12%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	21%	7%	21%	5%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	2%	0%	3%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	2%	0%	2%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	5%	2%	4%	3%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	3%	7%	2%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	5%	0%	0%	1%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	21%	22%	18%	22%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	5%	10%	14%	9%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	3%	0%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	2%	0%	2%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	2%	0%	2%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	5%	0%	0%	1%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	31%	28%	37%	27%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	74%	50%	59%	51%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	67%	43%	79%	39%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	62%	11%	28%	14%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	33%	40%	45%	40%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	78%	78%	77%	79%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	27%	14%	15%	16%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	27%	27%	39%	25%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	1%	0%	1%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	73%	64%	72%	62%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	27%	57%	33%	59%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	60%	74%	75%	73%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	75%	83%	70%	85%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	47%	51%	43%	52%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	22%	20%	11%	23%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	22%	19%	11%	21%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:				
12.12	Resettlement day release?	74%	67%	63%	69%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	69%	62%	61%	64%
	Have you had access to the following:				
12.13	Resettlement day release?	47%	54%	63%	53%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	38%	41%	44%	40%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	31%	27%	33%	27%
	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?	17%	20%	15%	20%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	27%	24%	33%	24%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	84%	72%	80%	73%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	27%	27%	28%	27%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	50%	43%	45%	45%

## Wing analysis



### Prisoner survey responses HMP & YOI Sudbury 2017

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

#### Key to tables

		P Wing	E & W Wing
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>47</b>	<b>141</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	2%
1.3	Are you on recall?	0%	1%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	4%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	17%	2%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	2%	2%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.	32%	41%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	13%	19%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	4%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	17%	8%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	11%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	45%	59%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	67%	63%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	41%	22%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	96%	88%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	0%	8%
2.4	Was the van clean?	59%	63%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	87%	82%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	92%	76%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	81%	75%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	15%	14%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	94%	85%

## Wing analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	P Wing	E & W Wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	64%	59%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	85%	81%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	76%	78%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	39%	39%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	6%	11%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	9%	7%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	4%	2%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	11%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	13%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	9%	8%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	4%	11%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	15%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	6%	7%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	47%	37%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	39%	33%
3.6	A shower?	24%	38%
3.6	A free telephone call?	44%	41%
3.6	Something to eat?	41%	63%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	28%	36%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	22%	46%



## Wing analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	P Wing	E & W Wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	48%	60%
3.7	Someone from health services?	61%	66%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	27%	29%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	25%	31%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	48%	52%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	41%	40%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	43%	53%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	46%	46%
3.8	Health services?	52%	58%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	39%	53%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	91%	88%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	98%	96%
	For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	59%	64%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	71%	76%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	41%	42%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	33%	27%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	28%	20%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	52%	50%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	89%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	58%	57%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	56%	42%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	87%	69%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	49%	47%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	44%	42%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	83%	72%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	56%	38%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	58%	62%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	64%	68%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	67%	67%

## Wing analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	P Wing	E & W Wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	94%	79%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	73%	61%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	59%	65%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	41%	44%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	37%	30%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	43%	47%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	25%	20%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	38%	22%
<b>SECTION 6: Relationships with staff</b>			
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	67%	67%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	63%	63%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	13%	18%
6.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	7%	8%
6.5	Do you have a personal officer?	67%	65%
	For those with a personal officer:		
6.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	77%	52%

## Wing analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	P Wing	E & W Wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 7: Safety</b>			
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	15%	22%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	4%	9%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	9%	16%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
7.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	2%	8%
7.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	1%
7.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	9%
7.5	Taken your canteen/property?	4%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	4%
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	4%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%

## Wing analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	P Wing	E & W Wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 7: Safety continued</b>			
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	16%	24%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	7%	9%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	0%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	10%
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	4%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	0%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
7.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	11%	29%

## Wing analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	P Wing	E & W Wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 8: Health services</b>			
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	25%	29%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	50%	53%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	11%	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?	40%	49%
8.2	The nurse?	52%	52%
8.2	The dentist?	57%	49%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	42%	45%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	53%	42%
	For those currently taking medication:		
8.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	96%	93%
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	15%	17%
	For those who have problems:		
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	50%	44%
<b>SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol</b>			
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	13%	10%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	9%	8%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	50%	37%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	41%	31%
9.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	4%	2%
9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	2%	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?	86%	100%
9.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	100%	100%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
9.9	Was the support helpful?	88%	94%

## Wing analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	P Wing	E & W Wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 10: Activities</b>			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
10.1	A prison job?	75%	65%
10.1	Vocational or skills training?	53%	49%
10.1	Education (including basic skills)?	67%	64%
10.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	33%	28%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
10.2	A prison job?	70%	81%
10.2	Vocational or skills training?	9%	18%
10.2	Education (including basic skills)?	16%	30%
10.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	0%	1%
10.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	98%	91%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
10.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	41%	46%
10.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	90%	71%
	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?	54%	58%
10.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	93%	79%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
10.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	50%	57%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	84%	66%
	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?	52%	40%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	71%	62%
10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	81%	69%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	59%	52%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	67%	75%
10.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	75%	85%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	50%	51%
<b>SECTION 11: Friends and family</b>			
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	46%	43%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	20%	20%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	20%	19%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	46%	32%

## Wing analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	P Wing	E & W Wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 12: Preparation for release</b>			
12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	98%	88%
	For those who have an offender manager what type of contact have you had:		
12.2	No contact?	13%	24%
12.2	Contact by letter?	29%	19%
12.2	Contact by phone?	75%	56%
12.2	Contact by visit?	36%	18%
12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	100%	95%
12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	98%	80%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
12.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	84%	81%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:		
12.6	nobody?	19%	26%
12.6	Offender supervisor?	71%	68%
12.6	Offender manager?	45%	24%
12.6	Named/ personal officer?	19%	14%
12.6	Staff from other departments?	7%	17%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	84%	79%
12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	17%	14%
12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	61%	31%
12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	7%	3%
12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	40%	31%
	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?	71%	42%
12.12	Accommodation?	69%	44%
12.12	Benefits?	69%	41%
12.12	Finances?	61%	36%
12.12	Education?	67%	52%
12.12	Drugs and alcohol?	73%	50%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
12.13	Resettlement day release?	82%	62%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	82%	56%
	Have you had access to the following:		
12.14	Resettlement day release?	80%	44%
12.14	Resettlement overnight release?	68%	31%
12.14	Special purpose leave?	46%	21%
	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?	23%	18%
12.15	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	33%	22%
12.15	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	73%	73%
12.15	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	30%	25%
12.15	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	47%	43%
12.15	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	63%	64%