



annual report



HM CHIEF INSPECTOR OF PRISONS
FOR ENGLAND AND WALES

2005/2006



annual report



HM CHIEF INSPECTOR OF PRISONS FOR ENGLAND AND WALES

2005/2006

Presented pursuant to Act. Eliz II 1952 c.52 s.5A (5)

Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 30 January 2007

London: The Stationery Office

£18.00

HC 210

Statement of purpose

To provide independent scrutiny of the conditions for and treatment of prisoners and other detainees, promoting the concept of "healthy prisons" in which staff work effectively to support prisoners and detainees to reduce reoffending or achieve other agreed outcomes.

© Crown Copyright 2007

The text in this document (excluding the Royal Arms and departmental logos) may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium providing that it is reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the document specified.

Any enquiries relating to the copyright in this document should be addressed to The Licensing Division, HMSO, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ. Fax: 01603 723000 or e-mail: licensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk

contents

Introduction	5
The year in brief	
The Inspectorate year	11
The prison year	13
The IRC year	16
The criminal justice year	17
Inspection activity elsewhere	18
Five years on...	
Local prisons and overcrowding	21
Safer custody	24
Substance use	29
Healthcare	32
Activities and training prisons	35
Young adults	38
Juveniles	40
Women	45
Race equality	49
Foreign nationals	52
Close supervision centres, segregation and dispersal prisons	54
Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners	57
Resettlement	59
Immigration detention	64
Appendices	
1. Inspections undertaken	69
2. Inspection reports published	72
3. Recommendations accepted	75
4. Outcome of recommendations	77
5. Healthy prison assessments	79
6. Healthy establishment assessments (IRCs)	81
7. Prisoner survey responses	82
8. Survey responses by ethnicity	88
9. Detainee survey responses	90
10. Expenditure	95
11. Inspectorate staff	96



introduction



Introduction

This is my fifth annual report. It describes the work and findings of the Inspectorate in reports published between September 2005 and August 2006, contained in 74 reports on inspections of prisons and places of immigration detention, four thematic reports, and contributions to 11 joint criminal justice inspection reports.

The report provides a comprehensive picture of the state of our prisons and immigration detention centres during that time. It also charts progress over the last five years against the recommendations and findings of Inspectorate reports and thematic reviews. In many key areas in prisons – such as safer custody, education and training, resettlement, juveniles and healthcare – there has been significant improvement. One notable statistic this year is the continuing fall in the number of self-inflicted deaths in prisons, in spite of population pressures. This must reflect the considerable efforts that have been made, in individual prisons and throughout the system, to try to support and care for the most vulnerable prisoners.



Anne Owers CBE
Chief Inspector of Prisons

There has been significant improvement in key areas over the last five years.

Improvements have come through large, national changes, such as the improved funding and quality of healthcare and education, or the increased focus on resettlement and community engagement. But, as our follow-up inspections record, progress has also come through the implementation in individual establishments, during the year, of over 2,000 detailed Inspectorate recommendations.

The Inspectorate has played a key role in recommending, promoting and monitoring these changes; but they could not have taken place without the commitment of those working within the prison and detention systems, and the political will to support and resource improvements. Conversely, where this has not been evident – for example in relation to foreign national prisoners and young adult prisoners – inspections have continued to show serious and worrying deficiencies in the care and treatment of those in custody.

There are, however, some important and increasingly disturbing caveats to the progress that this report records. The inspections it covers all took place before April 2006. Since then, the prison population has risen at an unprecedented rate. The only part of the prison population that remains stable is the 4,500 women; although here too, population pressures in the male prison estate have had a

damaging effect, with women's prisons being re-roled to hold men, destabilising often vulnerable women and leaving many further from home.

At the time of writing, the population is hovering around 80,000 – 3,000 more than at the same time last year, and almost 20% more than when I became Chief Inspector. In December 2006, our prisons held nearly 2,500 juveniles, 9,300 young adults and 8,300 indeterminate-sentenced prisoners. For the first time ever, there were more prisoners serving indeterminate sentences than those who were serving short sentences of less than 12 months. These are unparalleled increases. At the same time, there are resource constraints on public spending, which are likely to affect the quality of life in prisons both directly and indirectly. This is an alarming and potentially extremely damaging combination.

Alarming rises in the prison population threaten progress.

For example, the reduction in self-inflicted deaths is most evident in the early days of custody, assisted by better first night support and improved detoxification in some prisons. Yet a significant number of new prisoners (one in five of those arriving recently at one local prison) have been spending their first night, or nights, in police cells under Operation Safeguard, where there is none of this support. And prisoners experience longer journeys, travelling from one locked-out prison to another, to end up at prisons late and far from home. At the same time, funding for the new integrated drug treatment system, to provide interventions and support for those coming off drugs, is nearly 60% less than was hoped for.

Healthcare and education have both benefited from levered-in resources and expertise from outside the Home Office. But that also means they are vulnerable to upheaval and budgetary pressures elsewhere. The restructuring of primary care trusts, and the increasing demands on their budgets, have direct consequences for the fledgling prison healthcare arrangements. There have already been threats to funding, though these have now been withdrawn, at least for the present. Prison education, described by the Chief Inspector of the Adult Learning Inspectorate (ALI) as "perhaps the most heartening success" of the year, is now being delivered and funded through local learning and skills councils (LSCs). Here, too, there are changes and challenges. ALI, with its focus on vocational training, will be absorbed within Ofsted, which is itself facing significant cuts; and local LSCs will need to learn about, and prioritise, the specific and acute needs of prison education and training.

Finally, there is end-to-end offender management, described by a previous Home Secretary as a "once in a generation opportunity to transform the way we manage

offenders". This is being rolled out in a climate of considerable structural upheaval, population pressure and resource constraints. An early casualty was Custody Plus, the mechanism for post-release supervision of short-sentenced prisoners. There is considerable uncertainty about the future delivery of probation work and the role of regional offender managers. As I reported last year, there is still no effective national management of niche populations, such as women and indeterminate-sentenced prisoners. Throughout the system, the pressure of prisoner numbers constrains decisions about how to allocate resources, prevents prisoners being held within their home region, and has already contributed to significant backlogs in sentence planning assessments.

In that context, reports published since April 2006 show a disturbing trend. We assess each establishment against our four healthy prison tests: safety, respect, purposeful activity and resettlement. In all the prisons most affected by overcrowding – adult male local, training and open prisons – our assessments since April 2006 are less positive than they were in the previous 12 months (reported in The Year in Brief section). We have seen too many local prisons recently whose cultures and practices are sliding back, or failing to improve. Three local prisons, compared with only one for the whole of 2005–6, have been assessed as performing poorly on the key tests of safety and respect. Last year,

Inspection assessments are becoming less positive.

two-thirds of training prison assessments were positive; since April 2006 only half have been. Positive assessments for open prisons have dropped from 85% to 62%.

These are only straws in the wind – but the wind does not appear to be blowing in the right direction. And it is unlikely to be more favourable next year. True, more prison places are hurriedly being planned, but they are chasing ever-rising numbers. There is a real risk that already stretched resources within prisons will be spread even more thinly – while at the same time less will be available for necessary and effective interventions outside prison.

This report is therefore published at a critical point for prisons and the correctional system as a whole. It is by no means clear whether in five years' time we will look back on 2005–6 as a staging post in a slow and steady improvement, or as a turning point, when hard-won progress towards safe, decent and purposeful prisons faltered and began to slip back.

This poses critical political and resource questions for Ministers, both inside and outside the Home Office. And it is therefore all the more welcome that the Prisons Inspectorate, in its present form, will continue to be there to chart developments and to report on them accurately, robustly and in detail – even if the message

is sometimes uncomfortable. This was recognised by peers of all parties in the debates in the House of Lords in October, when the proposal to merge the Prisons Inspectorate within a broader criminal justice inspectorate was rejected. We are very grateful for the support of all those who appreciate the importance of protecting the specific nature of our work; and for the willingness of Government to acknowledge and respond to those concerns.

Prisons are not the only places of detention that need, and get, robust independent scrutiny. Our inspections of immigration removal centres (IRCs) and, most recently, immigration short-term holding facilities, have brought into the light some previously hidden practices, and stimulated some necessary reforms. The abandonment of strip-searching, the ability for detainees to carry out paid work, improvements in child protection and the hoped-for availability of internet and email access are all responses to repeated Inspectorate recommendations. Standards and guidance have also been issued, for the first time, by those running short-term holding facilities. But there remain some serious concerns. They include the detention of at least 2,000 children each year, usually for short periods but sometimes for weeks or months. They also include the fact that at the time

In spite of reforms in immigration detention, some serious concerns remain.

of writing the Immigration and Nationality Directorate is still unable to take timely action on foreign national prisoners, either in prisons or in IRCs, or to communicate effectively about the progress of individual cases, and continues to move detainees around the country from one place of detention to another. It remains to be seen whether proposed changes to casework management will improve matters.

During the next year, we will be continuing and expanding our joint work with other criminal justice inspectorates – including the inspection of offender management with the probation inspectorate and joint work with the inspectorate of constabulary to develop a methodology for the inspection of police custody suites. The latter is an important new development, given the use of police cells to house prisoners, and the new Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture, which requires independent inspection of all places of detention, and which came into effect in June 2006. This work draws on the core expertise of this Inspectorate, and the task of reporting on everything that happens in closed institutions will remain our principal, and vitally important, role.

This report is issued in my name. But it represents the committed and considerable efforts of all the staff of the Inspectorate, in what has been a very pressured and unsettled year. It is, by any standards, an impressive workload for an inspectorate with only 37 full-time and four part-time staff. The report shows that



each year, and over the years, their work has made a difference. Its importance is recognised overseas as well as in this country. Last year, the Correctional Services of Canada published two reports by us into women's federal prisons; and we contributed to the growing debate in the USA about prison conditions and oversight. This included appearing before the Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prisons, which concluded, as one of its four key recommendations:

The most important mechanism for overseeing corrections is independent inspection and monitoring. Every prison and jail should be monitored by an independent government body, sufficiently empowered and funded to regularly inspect conditions of confinement and report findings to lawmakers and the public.

Our work was cited as a leading example of such independent scrutiny. It is clear that it will be as crucial in the future as it has been in the past; and it is therefore both welcome and essential that it continues.

December 2006

the year in brief

The Inspectorate year	11
The prison year	13
The IRC year	16
The criminal justice year	17
Inspection activity elsewhere	18



The year in brief

The Inspectorate year

Inspections

During the reporting year (September 2005 – August 2006) we carried out inspections of¹

- 62 prisons and young offender institutions, 31 of them unannounced
- 5 immigration removal centres, 3 of them unannounced
- 18 immigration short-term holding facilities, all of them unannounced

worked on thematic reviews of

- recalled prisoners
- foreign national prisoners
- extreme custody
- mental health in prisons
- young adult prisoners

participated in

- 5 joint criminal justice area inspections
- 4 offender management inspections
- 2 youth offending team inspections
- a joint thematic review of public protection
- contributions to 5 joint area reviews of children's services

and carried out an inquiry into the quality of healthcare at Yarl's Wood IRC.

All full inspections are carried out jointly with the Adult Learning Inspectorate and/or Ofsted; the Healthcare Commission; the Dental Practice Division of the NHS Business Services Agency; and the Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain. This minimises burdens on inspected organisations, as well as allowing us to obtain a total picture of a custodial establishment, in which education and healthcare should be integral.

During the year, we published reports² on

- 64 prisons and young offender institutions
- 6 immigration removal centres
- 16 short-term holding facilities (in 4 reports)
- a thematic review of race relations

¹See Appendix 1 for details

²See Appendix 2 for details

- 3 short thematic reviews on women in prison, recalled prisoners and detainees under escort
- one joint thematic review on public protection, with HMI Probation and HMI Constabulary
- *Expectations* (3rd edition) and *Juvenile Expectations*: criteria for assessing conditions and treatment of adult and young prisoners

The content of inspection reports during the year is summarised in the sections that follow. Full inspection reports made 3,172 recommendations for improvement. All but 5% (147) of these recommendations were accepted, wholly or in principle, by those running prisons and immigration detention facilities.³

Twenty-nine of the inspection reports on prisons in England and Wales, and three of the IRC inspection reports, were of unannounced follow-up inspections, which are independent checks on progress actually made against previous recommendations (see below for the outcomes of these follow-up inspections).

Criteria and methodology

During the year, we revised and re-published *Expectations*, the criteria by which we inspect adult prisons. This is the third edition, and it takes into account the findings of Inspectorate thematic reports into race relations and older prisoners, as well as recent legislation in race and disability: with a revised section on race, and a new section on diversity. *Expectations* on health and resettlement (including work, learning and skills) have been substantially rewritten to reflect the changing landscape and the increasing focus on these important areas. This was a major task, overseen by the head of the research team, that drew on the accumulated knowledge of all the inspectors and team leaders.

At the same time, the Inspectorate's methodology was captured in a comprehensive inspection manual, to guide and ensure consistency among our inspection teams.

Feedback is an important part of our methodology. We therefore carry out exit surveys of inspected establishments, and annual stakeholder surveys to gauge the usefulness of our reports. Exit surveys ask inspected bodies about the information required, communication during the inspection, the conduct of inspectors, and understanding about the findings. Responses were broadly positive, with the great majority of respondents reporting that liaison and communication with teams was good, and that final feedback was fair.

Responses from stakeholders were also positive, with 96% finding reports easy to read, and 92% finding the structure easy to understand. The least positive response was in relation to the overall coverage of equality and diversity, which only three-quarters of respondents felt was covered completely or sufficiently. In particular, diversity issues other than race were thought not to be adequately covered: something that we have responded to in the new version of *Expectations*.

³See Appendix 3 for details



The prison year

IN BRIEF

In prisons, 95% of recommendations were accepted and 72% were implemented wholly or partially.

Inspections provide an overall picture of the state and progress of prisons during the inspection year. For reports published in 2005–6, this is in many ways an encouraging picture. Our follow-up inspection reports in 2005–6 found that, overall, 72% of the 2,729 recommendations followed up had been achieved or partially achieved.⁴

Training prisons did best, achieving nearly 80% of recommendations, wholly or partially. Local prisons did worst, with only a 67% success rate; though this was significantly affected by the poor performance of the two local prisons in the high security estate, Belmarsh and Woodhill. Women’s prisons were also disappointing, achieving only 69% of recommendations. Within each functional type, there were wide variations in the number of recommendations achieved, and it is noticeable that establishments that were already performing well were able to achieve the highest proportion of further recommendations.

Table 1: Recommendations achieved: highest and lowest

Type of prison	Highest	Lowest
Category C training prisons	Littlehey 92%	Featherstone 72%
Locals	Hull 79%	Belmarsh 54%
Women	Morton Hall 83%	Styal 54%
High security	Frankland 82%	Wakefield 56%

Inspection reports now measure the overall health of prisons. We assess each establishment to decide whether it is performing well, reasonably well, not sufficiently well or poorly under each of our four tests – safety, respect, purposeful activity and resettlement. We also carry out confidential surveys of prisoners. Both sets of information have been aggregated for reports published during the inspection year.⁵

IN BRIEF

It was encouraging during the year that in all types of prison, except local prisons, the balance of inspection assessments was positive.

We found that there were relatively few establishments that performed either well or poorly on any of our four tests. Out of 276 assessments in reports published in 2005–6, there were only 33 of the former and 11 of the latter. Overall, it was encouraging that during the year, in nearly all types of prison establishment, the balance of assessments was positive: there were more areas where prisons were performing well or reasonably well than those that were assessed as poor or not sufficiently good.

⁴See Appendix 4 for details

⁵See Appendices 5 and 6 for full details

IN BRIEF

In spite of improvements in safer custody, male local prisons accounted for 73% of deaths in custody in the reporting year, though they hold only about 36% of the population.

The exception was local prisons. Assessments on safety and respect in locals were fairly evenly balanced. However, in spite of some improved safer custody procedures, male locals during the reporting year accounted for 73% of deaths in custody, though they hold only 36% of the prison population. Cultures are also a continuing issue: surveys showed that these prisoners were more negative than any other prisoner group about their treatment by staff. Only two of the 13 local prisons inspected performed satisfactorily in relation to purposeful activity. These findings are also reflected in the overall prisoner survey responses, where fewer than a quarter of those surveyed felt that they were gaining useful employment skills or drug treatment, and only around a third felt that their education would be useful on release. Overall, only 30% of men in locals thought that they had done anything during their sentence which would make them less likely to reoffend. (See Appendix 7 and p 21 for more information about local prisons and the effects of overcrowding.)

IN BRIEF

Purposeful activity was unsatisfactory in five out of eight young adult prisons, though half of young adults said they had done something that would help prevent reoffending.

Inspectors also, however, assessed purposeful activity as unsatisfactory in a majority of training and young adult establishments. Again, this was supported in surveys, where fewer than half of those surveyed thought that they were obtaining skills or employment that would help them on release: though two-thirds of those in training prisons, and over half of young adults, did believe that they had done something that would make them less likely to offend in the future. Surveys found broadly positive relationships between staff and prisoners in training prisons; but much less so in young adult establishments, where use of force was also highest. It is also noticeable that young adults, of all adult prisoner groups, were the least likely to know how to contact the IMB, the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman, or how to make an application or complaint within the prison. (See Appendix 7 and pp 35–39 for more information about training and young adult prisons.)

IN BRIEF

Most women's prisons were assessed as safe, but this needs to be put in the context of the high rates of self-harm, particularly for some young women.

Women's prisons provide a mixed picture. Overall, most were assessed as safe, respectful and providing a reasonable amount of purposeful activity. But on resettlement there were more negative than positive assessments. This is of some concern, given that one of the rationales for returning women's prisons to area management was so that they could plug into area resettlement strategies. Safety, too, needs to be put in the context of the high rates of self-harm, particularly among young women, indicating significant levels of vulnerability and distress among those who self-harm prolifically. Indeed, of all the groups surveyed outside the high

security estate, women were most likely to report having felt unsafe, and to report victimisation by other prisoners. By contrast, relationships with staff were reported as good. (See Appendix 7 and p 45 for more information about women's prisons.)

IN BRIEF

The one resettlement prison inspected was the most successful and positive, with 95% of prisoners believing they had done something to prevent reoffending.

The group of adult prisons with the most positive balance of assessments were open and resettlement prisons, which unsurprisingly also came out most positively in prisoner surveys. It was, however, noticeable that the only resettlement prison inspected, Kirklevington Grange, was easily the most successful and positive, and 95% of its prisoners believed that they had done something there which would make them less likely to reoffend. Open prisons are dealing with a more challenging population, whose resettlement needs were not always properly assessed; their results were more mixed, and none scored well in resettlement. Nevertheless, between 72% and 90% of their prisoners believed they had been helped to stop offending: higher than in any other type of prison. (See Appendix 5 and p 59 for more information about resettlement and open prisons.)

IN BRIEF

All but one of the five juvenile establishments were assessed as at least reasonably safe; but surveys of all juveniles in prison showed that nearly a third of young people had felt unsafe, particularly in large units.

It is also encouraging that the assessments of juvenile prisons were positive overall. Of the five establishments inspected, all but one were assessed as at least reasonably safe, and all were assessed as at least reasonably effective in relation to resettlement and respect. The five are not entirely representative: they include the only juvenile open prison in the country, Thorn Cross, the small unit at Parc and the two smaller dedicated juvenile sites. Our two-year survey of all juveniles in prison does show an improvement in their perceptions of safety – but it also shows that nearly a third of young people had felt unsafe, and this was most pronounced in large units.

Surprisingly, given the resources expended, purposeful activity was a less positive picture in juvenile establishments, with two being assessed as unsatisfactory. The juvenile surveys also show no improvement in young people's perceptions of access to, or the value of, education and training. Inspections have often found the curriculum too narrow, with too little emphasis on higher education or vocational training. (See Appendix 5 and p 40 for more information about children and young people in prison.)

Given that dispersal prisons within the high security estate hold more challenging and dangerous offenders, who are unlikely to be released soon, it is not surprising that prisoner survey results were poorer for those prisons. Our assessments showed some improvements; but they and the surveys also raise some concerns. Arrangements for settling in new prisoners were the worst in the prison system. Though most dispersals were assessed as being reasonably safe, half of the

prisoners in them said they had felt unsafe at some time: pointing to the need to tackle the sophisticated forms of bullying that can take place in those prisons. Reported time out of cell was also poor, and inspection assessments of purposeful activity were unsatisfactory or poor in two out of the five prisons. (See Appendix 5 and p 54 for more information about dispersal prisons and segregation.)

Finally, it is of some concern that the four private adult prisons reported on had more negative than positive assessments, and only one out of four was assessed as performing satisfactorily on safety. This has been a recurring concern, in our inspection reports and in the National Audit Office's report, as has the nature of activity available, with contracts that tend to focus on quantity rather than quality.

The IRC year

IN BRIEF

IRCs failed to achieve 38% of recommendations, compared to only 28% in prisons; the detention of children continued to give rise to significant concerns, with key recommendations not yet achieved.

Developments within the IRC estate were less encouraging than in prisons. Overall, IRCs failed to achieve 38% of recommendations, compared with only 28% in prisons.⁶ Of the three IRCs followed up, only one, Dover, had more recommendations that were fully achieved than those that were not achieved. Many of these unachieved recommendations were, however, outside the control of the individual centres, and required action by the Immigration and Nationality Directorate.

Most centres were assessed as performing satisfactorily on safety and respect.⁷ However, half the detainees surveyed during the year reported having felt unsafe, though three-quarters believed they were well-treated by staff.⁸ This correlates with our findings that their insecurity largely stemmed from their immigration problems, and the increasing difficulty of obtaining advice and information about them. Nevertheless, perceptions of safety varied considerably: from Oakington and Lindholme, where only a third had felt unsafe, to Haslar, where three-quarters had. With a growing population that is both more mixed and more vulnerable, this is of some concern.

No centres were doing sufficiently well in relation to purposeful activity, and preparation for release was also mixed, with improvements in contact with the outside world, but little practical welfare assistance.

The detention of children continued to give rise to significant concerns, with key recommendations not yet achieved; and this was underlined in a series of structured interviews carried out with detained children at Yarl's Wood, which showed that the majority felt frightened or worried, had been ill, and had negative views of the centre.

⁶See Appendix 4

⁷See Appendix 6

⁸See Appendix 9



The criminal justice year

IN BRIEF

35 prison and IRC inspections were carried out jointly with education and healthcare inspectorates; and prison inspectors took part in 5 joint criminal justice area inspections.

During the year, a considerable amount of time was spent in planning for the proposed joint inspectorate of justice, community safety and custody. Prisons Inspectorate staff led work on the "special duty" to inspect places of custody – prisons, immigration detention facilities, court cells and police custody suites – drawing on our specific expertise and methodology and working with colleagues in the police and courts inspectorates. We remained concerned as to whether this specialist work could be effectively preserved in a much larger and differently-focused inspectorate, much of whose work would be across criminal justice.

The Inspectorate has nevertheless continued to participate in a considerable amount of joint work. As well as the 35 prison and IRC inspections carried out jointly with education and healthcare colleagues, inspectors took part in five joint inspections of local criminal justice areas: Gwent, Greater Manchester, Northumbria, Thames Valley and Avon and Somerset. We were able to follow up some of the concerns in the recent joint thematic report on courts and escorts. Inspections recorded some improvements in inter-agency working, but continuing concerns about the variable standards in court cells, and the lack of any certification process. Medical care in both police and court cells caused concern, and the provision of police and court liaison, and the arrangements for the diversion of mentally disordered offenders, were variable.

During the year we helped develop and pilot a methodology for inspecting offender management across custody and the community, in work led by HMI Probation, with whom we also undertook a joint thematic review of public protection work, alongside HMI Constabulary. Additionally, our juvenile team participated in two inspections of youth offending teams, with other inspectorates within and outside criminal justice; and our inspections of juvenile establishments fed into the joint area reviews of children's services led by Ofsted.

Ministers have withdrawn the proposals for a single inspectorate; but this joint work, building on our strengths and focusing on the important joins between prisons and the community, is set to continue. In particular, we will be looking to develop and implement methodologies for regular inspections of court and police cells, in partnership with HMI Courts Administration and HMI Constabulary; and to develop further the inspection of offender management as it goes live in prisons.

Inspection activity elsewhere

IN BRIEF

Our independent inspection criteria were used to inspect two prisons in Northern Ireland, two in the Channel Islands, and two in Canada.

As our inspection criteria are independent, and based upon best practice and human rights standards, they are easily applicable to prisons outside England and Wales. During the year, we published reports on two prisons in Northern Ireland, two in the Channel Islands and two in Canada: all carried out at the invitation of the responsible authorities there.

We carry out inspections of prisons in Northern Ireland under the authority of, and in partnership with, the Criminal Justice Inspectorate of Northern Ireland. Inspection reports published in 2005–6 were disappointing. Earlier inspections of male prisons had recorded progress in the culture of prisons and the outcomes for prisoners. However, poor industrial relations since then had set back progress significantly at the two prisons inspected: Hydebank Wood Young Offender Centre and Maghaberry.

Inspectors were particularly concerned at the insufficiency of purposeful activity at Hydebank Wood. At Maghaberry, which had additionally been severely affected by the introduction of separated regimes for paramilitary prisoners, nearly two-thirds of prisoners said they had felt unsafe at some time; systems for ensuring prisoner safety were under-developed; there was too little proactive staff involvement; and not enough work and training opportunities. This, as we record, is a significant challenge for the Northern Ireland Prison Service.

Inspections of the prisons in Jersey and Guernsey are carried out at the invitation of the home affairs authorities on the islands. Both islands have small prisons which need to carry out the functions of an entire prison system: holding charged and convicted men, women and children. Both were experiencing difficulties in discharging all these functions safely and decently. In Jersey, we were concerned about the safety and security of prisoners and staff, standards of accommodation, and the dearth of purposeful activity and resettlement work. In Guernsey, we had serious concerns about the provision for women, children and remanded prisoners, and the limited staff resources and training to deal with them. In both prisons, however, there were good relationships between prisoners and staff, and a willingness to learn from inspection and progress further.

In 2005, we were asked to carry out inspections of two women's federal prisons in Canada, at the invitation of the Correctional Services of Canada (CSC). This was part of the CSC's action plan in response to a critical report by the country's Human Rights Commission. These inspections found much to commend. Women were held in small, relaxed living units, rather than cellular accommodation, had a considerable degree of responsibility and freedom, and were fully occupied with purposeful activity and offending behaviour programmes. There were extremely low levels



of suicide and self-harm. However, there were concerns about the levels of bullying in the unsupervised units, and in particular about the development of maximum secure units, to hold difficult and challenging women in extremely restrictive cellular conditions, which was at odds with the culture and ethos of the rest of the establishment. Those units held disproportionately high levels of Aboriginal women. There was also a need to focus more strongly on meeting women's employability needs, as well as criminogenic ones. Nevertheless, there is much that the prison system in England and Wales could learn from these open and relaxed environments.

five years on...

Local prisons and overcrowding	21
Safer custody	24
Substance use	29
Healthcare	32
Activities and training prisons	35
Young adults	38
Juveniles	40
Women	45
Race equality	49
Foreign nationals	52
Close supervision centres, segregation and dispersal prisons	54
Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners	57
Resettlement	59
Immigration detention	64





Local prisons and overcrowding

Overcrowding threatens all of the Inspectorate's tests of a healthy prison: safety, respect, purposeful activity and resettlement. The prison population, particularly in local prisons, is in constant churn. The vulnerable may not be properly identified. Prisoners are much more likely to be locked in their cells for lengthy periods. Most prisons are less safe than they were a year ago.

HMCIP Annual Report, 2001–2

In August 2001, the prison population was 67,056. Five years later, in August 2006, it had reached 79,913: an increase of nearly 20%, with a sudden steep rise in mid-2006.

The pressures identified in 2001, especially on local prisons, have clearly increased. Inspections have played a key part in encouraging better performance and highlighting deficiencies. But at the time of writing, local prisons are experiencing renewed and growing pressure. As Appendix 5 shows, they are the only part of the prison system where, overall, our assessments of performance are more negative than positive.

We published inspection reports on 14 local prisons during the reporting period, and three shortly afterwards, at a time of maximum population growth. Many reports showed establishments struggling to provide decent and purposeful regimes for prisoners in their care. It was noticeable that the two local prisons that are part of the high security estate, Belmarsh and Woodhill, performed particularly poorly on our four healthy prison tests; and the prisoner survey results for Belmarsh were significantly worse than other local prisons across a range of areas. This suggests that insufficient attention was being paid to the short-term and remanded prisoners who form the great majority of the population. Safety was also an issue in all the local private prisons we inspected.

The pressure of numbers and the constant movement of prisoners clearly affect the care that can be provided to the most vulnerable. In his report into the killing of Zahid Mubarek, Mr Justice Keith drew a connection between population pressure, under-resourcing and safety. Nearly three-quarters of self-inflicted deaths in this reporting year took place in male local prisons, compared with 60% last year – in spite of improvements in first night and induction procedures in many prisons (see safer custody section).

All the prisons inspected were operating at the limits of capacity: as a consequence, accommodation that was not fit for use, or for its present occupation levels, was being used. Swansea was operating at 42% above its certified normal accommodation; Leeds was holding two men in each of 340 cramped and sometimes poorly ventilated cells designed for single use.

- “ The prison was very overcrowded. Nearly all cells were shared, with unscreened toilets, and prisoners also had to eat their meals there. ” [Swansea]
- “ B wing was unfit for habitation at the time of the inspection and lacked adequate ventilation and heating. Single cells were used for two prisoners and the toilets were poorly screened. ” [Leeds]

This overcrowding had consequences for activity as well as decency. Doncaster had fewer than 40% of its prisoners in work, and most of those were in domestic wing work; at Belmarsh, 40% of prisoners had no allocated work, and they could spend as little as two hours a day out of their cells.

Access to purposeful activity was poor in most local prisons: only two out of the 13 inspected were assessed as performing well or reasonably well, and they were both prisons operating under a contract or service level agreement. In some other contracted-out prisons, however, the quality of what was provided out of cell was poor.

Though most local prisons were making greater attempts to provide consistent, if limited, regimes for their prisoners, the pressure of increased numbers inevitably had a damaging effect. Only 30% of prisoners in local prison surveys said that they had done anything while in prison that would make them less likely to reoffend, and less than a quarter felt that their job, education, training or drug programmes would help on release. As in previous years, the true extent of the problem was masked by inaccurate and sometimes wildly exaggerated figures.

- “ Time out of cell was not being accurately recorded, and greatly exaggerated numbers of hours out of cell were being submitted. For a large number of prisoners, time out of cell was rarely more than three and a half hours a day. ” [Lincoln]
- “ The prison recorded that prisoners had 10 hours out of cell daily. This was not possible for any prisoner, and unemployed prisoners were out for no more than two hours. ” [Belmarsh]

In previous annual reports, we have commended the improved cultures and better staff–prisoner relationships in many local prisons. Though this remains the case in some, there are worrying signs that old cultures are returning under pressure in some large inner-city locals, such as Leeds. Smaller prisons, even those that have previously had poor cultures, such as Lewes and Bedford, seem to fare better. There was a different kind of problem at Forest Bank, a contracted-out prison, where we described a “culture of tolerance of, and acquiescence with, inappropriate behaviour” which threatened the safety of staff and prisoners.

In prisons under pressure, the needs of specific groups could be neglected, such as vulnerable prisoners, or the growing number of prisoners serving indeterminate sentences. This was exacerbated by the fact that those prisoners were often spending too long in local prisons, which could not in any event meet their needs, because of population pressure in the training prisons to which they needed to move.

As in 2001–2, local prisons continue to be at the sharp end of overcrowding pressure: significantly over-represented both in the statistics of self-inflicted deaths, and among those prisons with poor standards of decency and respect. They are least likely to be able to provide opportunities for rehabilitation and activity; and are now even less able to move prisoners to places that can provide them. Poor management and negative cultures add to those pressures; but no local prison can avoid them.

Safer custody

“Any successful suicide reduction strategy must be broadly focused, requiring the development and maintenance of high professional standards of care, supported by basic care practices that are seen as an essential part of the everyday work of all staff in prisons.”

Suicide is everyone’s concern, 1999

The 1999 Inspectorate thematic report on suicide was a major catalyst for change, and contributed significantly to the Prison Service’s strategy review in 2001. That review focused on prevention rather than awareness, and led to the setting up of the Safer Custody Group.

The five years since then have seen a focus on local prisons; support in the crucial early days of custody; the appointment of suicide prevention coordinators in high risk prisons; additional peer support schemes; and the introduction of the assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) process: designed to provide multi-disciplinary interventions, rather than simply monitoring those at risk. In the dispersal estate, too, concerns about deaths in segregation units have led to improvement in the management of those units and the prisoners in them. In addition, another of the Inspectorate’s key recommendations, the independent investigation of deaths in custody, has been achieved by designating this task to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman.

These developments have undoubtedly contributed to the fact that, in a rising prison population, the number of self-inflicted deaths has fallen, from a high of 102 in our reporting year 2003–4 to 63 in the current reporting year. What is even more noticeable is the fall in the number of deaths that occur in the early days of custody. In 2003–4, 32% of self-inflicted deaths occurred within a prisoner’s first seven days at an establishment; this year, that figure has fallen to 8%. Over half the self-inflicted deaths in 2003–4 took place within the first 28 days; this year, less than a quarter did. That must reflect improved care during that period: better detoxification, and a greater focus on first night and induction procedures, particularly in local prisons.

Table 3: Self-inflicted deaths in custody

	2005–06	2004–05	2003–04	2002–03
First 7 Days	5	19	33	26
8 to 14	2	8	7	7
15 to 21	5	6	10	6
22 to 28	3	5	5	5
Over 28 days	48	46	47	53

Inspection reports record the effect of this. Local prisons still struggled with unpromising physical conditions, late arrivals, and insufficient time given to assess prisoners' needs. But there had been improvements in many prisons inspected, with dedicated first night units and improved induction procedures. Perhaps the most significant improvements were those we recorded at Styal prison, where six women had previously died in the early days of custody.

It is therefore particularly disappointing when we find so-called "first night centres" that are merely a collection of cells, sometimes in poor condition (as at Doncaster), or where Inspectorate recommendations on reception, first night and induction remained unimplemented in spite of deaths in the early days (as at Woodhill).

- “ The alleged "first night centre" was a wing of poorly-maintained, often dirty cells where no support was available for newly-received prisoners, and where some prisoners were at risk from others. ” [Doncaster]
- “ Procedures for reception, first night and induction had been transformed. Women were received into a relaxed and bright reception area and passed to a supportive and well-staffed first night centre. ” [Styal]

Though the number of suicides has decreased, there are some worrying trends. First, the proportion of self-inflicted deaths that take place in male local prisons is rising – from 60% in the last reporting year to 73% this year; though these prisons hold only about 36% of the prison population. Cell-sharing, endemic in local prisons, is clearly not acting to reduce this percentage. Second, the number of self-inflicted deaths occurring after the first 28 days has remained virtually static. This suggests that the support mechanisms in the initial period fade away later on, or are inadequate to deal with long-term need, particularly mental disorder; that was certainly the case at Styal. And 46% of deaths occur among prisoners with identified problems and vulnerabilities: in healthcare, vulnerable prisoner units or segregation.

This emphasises the importance of the new ACCT system. It was designed to provide a more proactive and multi-disciplinary response to suicide and self-harm than its process-driven predecessor, the F2052SH, which was criticised in the Inspectorate thematic report and in subsequent inspection reports. We have come across some impressive examples of good practice: good initial assessments, clear and meaningful care plans and well-managed reviews. But we have also come across a number of establishments where the practice does not match the theory; and it is worrying in those cases that there are fewer procedural safeguards for reviewing and closing ACCT forms.

Staff training was poor in 1999, with two-thirds of staff having had no training in suicide and self-harm prevention. This situation has improved, particularly in the transition to the ACCT system; but it will be necessary to keep this up to date, now that this training is no longer mandatory.

The decline in the number of self-inflicted deaths among women (down from 28 in the two years 2002–4 to eight in the most recent two-year period) was particularly welcome. But it has been accompanied in some establishments by an increase in the use of force and segregation for seriously self-harming women. This may protect women for the moment, but cannot deal with the underlying causes. There is insufficient therapeutic support, especially for sexual abuse victims: for example, there was a six-month wait for counselling at Send. Prisoner Listeners were often overstretched and sometimes unable to reach prisoners in the most vulnerable parts of the prison.

Women remain disproportionately likely to self-harm, accounting for 52% of incidents, though they are only 5% of the population. What is also noticeable is that 31% of female self-harm incidents involved young people under 21, who account for only 1% of the female population.

**Table 4: Self-harm incidents by age and gender
(1 September 2005 to 31 July 2006)**

	Number	%
Female juveniles	225	2%
Female young adults	3244	29%
Female adults	7243	65%
Female incidents (age unknown)	379	3%
Male juveniles	606	6%
Male young adults	1740	17%
Male adults	6702	67%
Male incidents (age unknown)	972	10%

Some prisons seemed better able to deal with self-harm than others. Eastwood Park recorded over six incidents a day, compared with Low Newton and Bronzefield, which had fewer than two. What was noticeable was that the two latter prisons had an active regime for women, with access to work and purposeful activity. Inspections regularly record a dearth of individual counselling to deal with the underlying problems behind self-harm – and it was particularly regrettable that the innovative Carousel programme at Brockhill was a casualty of the prison's re-role to a male establishment.

Violence reduction

The other key component of safer custody is protecting prisoners against violence and bullying – and here inspection reports show a less positive picture. Though each prison now has an overall violence reduction strategy, the quality of these strategies varied considerably, and in several

inspections we raised the concern that the amalgamation of violence reduction and suicide prevention into a single safer custody committee had reduced the focus on tackling bullying. That has consequences for prisoners' confidence in the system and willingness to report bullying. Some establishments were less safe than they had been at the time of the previous inspection; and time after time we identified gaps in the training of staff to deal with bullying. Inspections did not often find good practice, such as that identified at Moorland.

“ All prisoners attended a week-long anti-bullying course at the end of the induction programme. Since the introduction of this course, the incidence of bullying had been reduced by 62%. ” [Moorland]

Our own surveys show considerable variation in the extent to which prisoners feel safe. In dispersal prisons, holding high risk prisoners, bullying can be both planned and sophisticated: in those prisons around half of prisoners reported having felt unsafe, compared with around a third in other closed prisons. But there was also significant variation between prisons of the same type. Belmarsh scored very poorly on most aspects of safety, with half its prisoners feeling unsafe; by contrast, less than a quarter had felt unsafe at Holme House and Swansea. Overall, in all types of prison, black and minority ethnic prisoners were more likely to report feeling unsafe.

Prisons are required to complete their own prisoner surveys on bullying at least bi-annually, but many establishments fail to act on the results. Bullying for drugs is of particular concern, since it may feed into gang activity within prisons. Where that gets out of control, and there is inadequate staff supervision, as at Risley, serious assaults and even death can result. Some prisons resorted too readily to segregation, or quasi-segregation, to deal with perpetrators or victims, rather than tackling the underlying problems.

“ Risley's bullying problems stemmed mainly from drug dealing and gangs that operated on the wings. Many prisoners reported feeling unsafe, few staff were visible when prisoners were unlocked and only six prisoners, five of whom were from the vulnerable prisoner unit, had been identified as bullies. ”

Inspection reports clearly identified the links between bullying and suicide and self-harm. At Blakenhurst, the effective management of bullying had produced a significant reduction in self-harm. Conversely, at Doncaster, self-harming prisoners told staff that this was due to bullying that had not been dealt with.

In spite of the publicity around the murder of Zahid Mubarek by his cell mate, we continue to find ineffective procedures for determining whether a prisoner poses a risk in a shared cell. Sometimes the prison has very limited information on newly-arrived prisoners; but that underlines the importance of giving sufficient time and private space to properly assess their risks and fears.

Allegations of victimisation by staff are of particular concern, and in some prisons reached worrying levels, as at Belmarsh, and at Leeds – and at the latter prison the inspection also raised issues about the running of the segregation unit. These were upheld at a subsequent disciplinary inquiry, and as a consequence new procedures and better oversight were put in place. Recent inspections of large local prisons have raised considerable concerns about the robustness of procedures for investigating serious complaints against staff; and we have fed these into a current Prison Service review of such procedures.

“ Prisoners reported high levels of bullying and intimidation, from staff as well as other prisoners. We also had concerns about the management of the segregation unit, and the support and management of prisoners at risk there. ” [Leeds]

It is clear that over the last five years there has been significant attention to, and improvements in, the care of suicidal and self-harming prisoners, which respond to many of the concerns raised by the Inspectorate in its 1999 thematic report. Nevertheless, the pressures on prisons and prisoners are growing; the rates of self-harm, particularly among women, remain of great concern; and it is clear that the crowded prison system cannot deal with the fundamental causes of suicidal and self-harming behaviour. Inspection reports also show that other key and linked aspects of safer custody – bullying, intimidation and violence – remain under-developed and are in need of greater and more focused attention.

Substance use

“There are signs of improving practice, but some significant gaps and weaknesses. A number of prisons are disregarding the Prison Service Order on clinical services for substance misusers. Some CARATs teams concentrate on assessment, rather than outcomes. Only a minority of prisons support drug users on return to the community. One of the most important gaps is the absence of any Prison Service strategy on alcohol.”

HMCIP Annual Report, 2001–2

These were the four key concerns we expressed five years ago, at a time when considerable resources had been put into prisons to deal with the problem of substance misuse: which has if anything grown and become more complex in the interim.

Safe detoxification (or maintenance) is a critical part of safer custody. It has improved considerably, particularly in women’s prisons, where it has undoubtedly contributed to the reduction in self-inflicted deaths. The picture in men’s prisons is improving, though it remains more patchy, with some worrying inadequacies in prescribing regimes. Substitute treatment is not, however, the only component of clinical management – and the new integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) envisages it being part of a whole set of interventions and support mechanisms. Funding has only just been agreed for this programme, and until now there have not been the resources, the training or the skilled staff to deliver it safely across the estate. The recent announcement of reduced funding could have a substantial impact on the implementation of this hugely important initiative.

“ Safe detoxification procedures had been introduced, but they needed to be provided in a dedicated detoxification centre, where prisoners could be properly supported. ”
[Belmarsh]

One key component is well coordinated care from both care, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) teams and health services. In some prisons, they operate as separate silos: though a few, such as Thorn Cross, were models of good practice. One important area for cooperation is the support of prisoners with dual mental health and substance use problems, and this was absent in two women’s prisons we inspected this year.

We have consistently pointed out the need for a national prison alcohol strategy, in a service where 63% of sentenced men and 39% of sentenced women have been classified as hazardous drinkers. A strategy was finally published in 2004, but without earmarked resources, services remain patchy. Prisons that have done population needs analyses have established that a quarter of their population require alcohol services – yet most CARATs contracts excluded prisoners

whose sole problem is alcohol: even young people, where the need for this is greatest. This was not the case at Swaleside, which provided a model of good practice.

“ Alcohol formed part of the CARAT service’s remit, and an alcohol management group work module had been developed. ” [Swaleside]

It is welcome that the Youth Justice Board’s 2005 national service specification for under-18s includes all substances – such as alcohol and tobacco. We saw some good examples of this in practice at Feltham and Werrington. There are, however, still some gaps in clinical management, group work and post-release support.

There have also been improvements in the services provided by CARATs teams, following the re-tendering of contracts in 2004–5. Most – though not all – offer both group work and one to one work. Inspections have also recorded improvements in case management, with some exceptions. In addition, more rehabilitation programmes are available – and we have welcomed in particular the short duration programme, which for the first time provides a structured intervention for short-term prisoners.

Nevertheless, some problems remain. First, inspections find that it is rare for prisons to have, or to use, needs analyses of their population to ensure that the right services are being provided. Those that did were able to target services much more effectively.

Second, we too often find that a lack of coordination reduces the effectiveness of interventions. Several prisons had developed their own different relapse prevention programmes, which was a waste of resources. A number of prisons were unable to provide programmes that met the range of needs or offered continuity. And ensuring that the right prisoners could access scarce and expensive resources such as the 12-step Addiction Rehabilitation Centre (ARC) programme was ever more difficult as population pressures increased. Finally, the increase in crack cocaine use has not been mirrored by appropriate programmes and interventions in all prisons.

The expansion of post-release community support for drug users has been a significant feature of the last five years. Since 2004, this has taken the form of drug intervention programmes (DIPs), aiming to provide continuity of provision between prison and the community. Overall, inspections have reported positively on these services, which prioritise Class A drug users – though provision for young offenders is very patchy.

“ Each member of the CARATs team was allocated to a London borough and there were good links with local drug intervention programme services. This afforded good and effective community links and consistent lines of communication. ” [Brixton]

Controlling the supply of drugs into prisons remains an important task. Mandatory drug testing (MDT) is the principal measure for this, and voluntary drug testing (VDT) one of the tools. There has been a downward trend in MDT positive results over the years: though the results regularly underestimate the usage as reported by prisoners. At Long Lartin, for example, 39% of prisoners said that it was easy or very easy to get hold of drugs, but the MDT positive rate was only 9%. We found gaps in testing in many establishments, with inconsistencies in target and weekend testing; though at others, like Doncaster, there was a more effective and integrated approach.

All prisons operated voluntary drug testing and many had special VDT units, but their remit was often unclear. In some cases, they were enhanced wings, where compliance rather than voluntary testing was taking place. In only a few establishments was there a risk-based approach to testing frequency. This is often one of the weakest aspects of prison drug strategies, without clear aims and objectives.

Over the last five years, there have therefore been noticeable improvements in the four areas of concern raised in 2001 – though, as ever, need outstrips supply. The identification of need, the coordination of services within, between and beyond prisons, and the development of crack cocaine and alcohol programmes and interventions are areas that need further development. Controlling the supply of drugs within prisons remains a considerable challenge, but one that is greatly assisted by measures to reduce demand, and to support recently detoxified prisoners.

Healthcare

"It is no longer sensible to maintain a healthcare service for prisoners separate from the National Health Service. There is an immediate need for the Home Office and the Department of Health, together with the Prison Service and the National Health Service, to agree a timetable for the NHS to assume responsibility for the commissioning and provision of healthcare and health provision in prisons."

Patient or prisoner?, 1996

This main recommendation of the Inspectorate's 1996 thematic report was echoed in my first annual report in 2001. Five years after that, by April 2006, all the healthcare in public sector prisons in England and Wales was commissioned and funded by the NHS. Inspection arrangements have moved to reflect those changes. A memorandum of understanding between this Inspectorate and the Healthcare Commission provides for the delivery of healthcare to be inspected by us, and fed into Healthcare Commission assessments, while the Commission itself inspects the commissioning arrangements. This is working well, and will be replicated with the Healthcare Inspectorate for Wales.

Inspections found that the relationship between prisons and the NHS was generally working well, provided that there was good liaison on both sides. Some primary care trusts (PCTs) had appointed specialist staff to develop prison services and liaise with prison healthcare managers. Most prisons now have experienced healthcare managers from a nursing or specialist background, represented on the senior management team: another of the recommendations from *Patient or prisoner?* But without the active interest of the PCT, and effective management within prisons, cracks could and did appear.

“ The PCT had appointed a prison healthcare development manager, and there was evidence of a strong working partnership between the trust, the manager and healthcare. A revised health needs assessment had been published. ” [Holme House]

“ The head of healthcare regularly attended PCT meetings but was finding it difficult to modernise the service due to a lack of focus within the PCT. Mental health in-reach services had been recommended in the needs assessment but we were unable to find out when this would eventually start. ” [Blundeston]

Clinical supervision of healthcare staff was completely absent in 1996 and 2001. In spite of our repeated recommendations, this has been slow to develop, and the majority of establishments still do not have effective, or sometimes any, provision. Access to training, too, remains variable and is often hindered by lack of funding or staff cover for absences. It was of particular concern that we sometimes found healthcare staff without up-to-date training in resuscitation.

The thematic review also stressed the need to assess healthcare needs in each prison. In 2001, it was rare to find prisons with health needs assessments – but they now exist in all NHS-commissioned health services. However, inspections find that they are of varying quality and relevance. In one prison, where the over-60 population had trebled in the three years since the last inspection, the needs assessment had not been updated. Best practice found in other prisons, however, was to review the health needs analysis annually.

In 1996, it was clear that primary medical care was not equivalent to that provided in the community, and this was only slowly developing in 2001, held back by staff shortages, poor physical conditions and management weaknesses. Inspections now find that in the majority of establishments prisoners have access to a registered GP, often from a local practice: though a few establishments were still reliant on locum cover, sometimes provided by non-registered GPs. The main problem, in many prisons, was the management of waiting lists, to ensure that these services were used effectively, and that prisoners had ready access to appropriate treatment. This also applied to dental waiting lists, which had improved generally, but which stretched to three months at one local prison.

Clinical management of prisoners with lifelong conditions tended to be poor, though there were examples of good practice. For example, at Coldingley, there was a health database of all prisoners and a register of all those with lifelong conditions, for example diabetes and asthma, with regular follow-up. Yet, at another prison, no-one could tell inspectors how many prisoners with specific illnesses the prison held. Improvements in information technology would greatly assist effective clinical management; but its introduction has been slow.

A key finding of the 1996 thematic report, and of all annual reports, has been the inadequacy of provision for mentally disordered prisoners. Considerable extra resources have been provided, both to improve primary care and to create mental health in-reach teams to support those with severe and enduring mental health problems. Yet provision is still variable, and unable to meet the scale of need, particularly for primary mental healthcare. In some prisons, too, the relationships between primary mental health providers and in-reach teams were poor, to the detriment of patient care. In others, however, teams worked well and had forged links with community-based mental health services to provide continuity of care, using the care programme approach.

“ There were six in-patients, all with mental health issues. Two were on constant watch and one was awaiting transfer to a secure mental health facility. In-patients spent most of the day unlocked but had no therapeutic regime and appeared simply to be housed in healthcare rather than being given structured care. ” [Low Newton]

Mental health within prisons remains one of our major and continuing concerns. For that reason, the Inspectorate is undertaking a thematic review into mental health within prisons, to be published in mid-2007.

Increasingly, prisoners are able to hold their medications in possession, after risk assessments of both the drug and the patient. Inspections found that most, but not all, prisons had effective policies for this. Where medications could not be held in possession, inspections sometimes found that they were administered at inappropriate times, which can result in the medication being less effective, and there were some cases of unsafe or secondary dispensing and inadequate audit and stock control. In one prison, inadequate supervision of the medicines queue and over-prescribing of opiate-based medication had led to serious problems with trading and bullying for drugs.

There have been improvements in dentistry services, recorded in inspections this year. However, there were serious concerns about some of the facilities and equipment in some establishments, where health and safety guidelines were not followed. Inspections identified the need for better oral health promotion (bearing in mind the limited reading skills of many prisoners) and the need to ensure that dental clinical notes were stored securely and kept with patients' clinical records.

Overall, and at present, the service provided in public sector prisons has improved considerably over the last five years, in a direction that was promoted and has been closely monitored by our expert healthcare inspectors. There are some warning signs, however. There are considerable pressures on primary care trusts, and it will be important to ensure that prison healthcare does not once again slip out of sight and down the list of priorities. Mental healthcare, within and outside prisons, remains a major challenge. Prisons are also slow to recognise the specific needs of older and black and minority ethnic prisoners – as recommended in two recent Inspectorate thematic reports. And there are concerns about some of the private sector provision, in both prisons and immigration removal centres. Health services there are separately commissioned, without the supporting framework of accountability in the public sector, and there is a danger of inconsistency, less supervision and procedures that drift away from best practice.

Activities and training prisons

“The amount and quality of education and training has undoubtedly increased. However, we continue to find, on a regular basis, that prisons over-estimate the amount of time prisoners spend out of their cells, and that activities do not necessarily relate to prisoners’ assessed needs, or to providing skills that will be useful on release. In some training prisons, only a third of prisoners surveyed said that they were taking part in training or education.”

HMCIP Annual Report, 2001–2

Five years ago, inspections often found that activities, even in so-called training prisons, consisted of repetitive contract work or (often theoretical) cleaning and orderly activity. Since then, there have been improvements and a significant change in how activities are perceived, managed and funded.

Important drivers for change were the transfer of responsibility for funding and commissioning to the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) in 2001 (and then to local Learning and Skills Councils), and the recognition that skills and employability were crucial to the new resettlement agenda. This led to additional funding, the appointment of a head of learning and skills in each prison, and the inclusion of employment and skills training as one of the seven resettlement pathways.

Inspection arrangements have shadowed and promoted these developments. All full inspections are carried out jointly, under agreed protocols, with the Adult Learning Inspectorate (ALI), Ofsted and Estyn. The education inspectorates examine the quality and appropriateness of education and training; our inspectors examine the quantity of activity and the links with the overall regime and resettlement work.

In 2002–3, inspections found that only five out of 19 training prisons were able to provide adequate employment and training; nine offered no accredited training at all, and many had half their population locked up during the working day. At the same time, ALI found that 78% of all education provision was inadequate.

There has been considerable progress since then. ALI’s 2004–5 inspections found a reduction, to 55%, in inadequate education provision. In 2005–6, this had significantly reduced to only 16%. In this reporting year, of the 18 training prisons inspected, we found that half met most of our expectations on purposeful activity: nine were assessed as performing well or reasonably well.

“ Only 16 per cent of the 25 prisons and young offender institutions inspected in 2005–6 had inadequate learning and skills provision, compared with over a half a year earlier. ”
[Chief Inspector, ALI, Annual Report December 2006]

In spite of these evident improvements, the Parliamentary Learning and Skills Committee, to which we and the education inspectorates gave evidence, found education and training to be suffering from the lack of an over-arching strategy, little sense of ownership and no high level champion in DfES to move things forward.

Progress has not been helped by the fact that many prisons have inflated the amount of purposeful activity actually taking place, or have failed to fill the activity spaces they have. This remained the case in nine of the training prisons inspected. In spite of the undoubted pressure on prisons, it is incumbent on managers to ensure that resources are not wasted and that statistics kept are accurate. It was of particular concern that two of the prisons holding life-sentenced prisoners had little purposeful employment or training for men who will spend long periods 'marking time' between reviews and offending behaviour programmes.

There were some common features of improving prisons: greater management focus to ensure that prisoners got to activities, and on time; equitable pay scales for education; strong vocational emphasis in workshops; good links between individual learning plans and sentence planning targets. Some establishments were making good links with outside agencies and offering educational opportunities outside the usual narrow curriculum. We also welcomed the increasing use of effective peer mentoring schemes, such as the *ToebyToe* literacy scheme.

Equally, there were some common features among the less well-performing prisons: inadequate planning for an increased population; poor management of existing activity spaces; limited library access; late arrivals in classes due to incompatible regimes; fewer opportunities for accreditation. In some inspections, good and well-organised libraries were simply inaccessible for most of the time.

“ There were very few curtailments of the working day. Significant improvements had been made in access to work and education through the expansion of part-time activities and good management systems. ” [Littlehey]

“ There were excessive interruptions to lessons. There was no system that allowed a prisoner to finish one qualification before moving on to the next. Classes often started later and finished earlier than planned. All of this contributed to slow progress and attainment on courses. ” [Risley]

The picture on vocational training was variable, with ALI identifying some good teaching, but also an over-reliance on singleton posts which could mean cancellation of classes at short notice.

The quality of work provided was mixed. In some establishments there continued to be over-reliance on menial production work. Parc, a private prison holding a large proportion of sentenced prisoners, was meeting its contractual requirements to get prisoners into workshops; however, only six of the 68 prisoners in workshops were actually working, and the majority of work was unskilled and repetitive. In some of the other poorly performing prisons there were insufficient

activity places, with large numbers of prisoners locked up: in one case some prisoners spent 21 hours a day in their cells.

Inadequate resources and space often inhibited progress. But so too did outdated prison cultures, which saw training and education as marginal, not central. This was one of ALI's frequent criticisms. Prisons focusing on a single, positive task tended to do better overall in our inspection assessments and in prisoner surveys. Usk, for example, which saw itself as a 'programme prison', performed extremely well; whereas Parkhurst, which was operating as a number of separate silos and retains some of the culture of its high security days, produced the worst survey results and assessments of all the trainers inspected this year.

“ Prisoners were well engaged in purposeful activities in the workshops, three of which had been put forward for regional awards. ” [Moorland]

“ On one morning of the inspection, we found that only six out of the 60 prisoners in workshops were actually working. There was little work skills training. ” [Parc]

There continued to be failures to join up education and skills provision with the work of the prison as a whole, with what had happened in other prisons, or with sentence planning targets. Education and skills training targets were not always used, and there was too little joined-up planning between local and training prisons, though this improved where OASys assessments were available. Some establishments were making good efforts to link prisoners' individual learning plans to sentence planning targets and the possibility of future employment. A central, well-managed activities board, using information from a range of sources, was a feature of well-performing prisons.

The Government's 2005 Green Paper, *Reducing reoffending through skills and employment*, and the Reducing Reoffending Corporate Alliance, launched in November 2005, set out a strategy to transform the skills and employment prospects of offenders: engaging employers, increasing the quality and amount of learning and skills provision and seeking greater coherence across the service. This was a considerable challenge, now made even more challenging with the rise in prisoner numbers.

Responsibility for commissioning and funding education and training in prisons will now largely be a regional one, through regional offender managers and regional learning and skills councils. It remains to be seen whether these complex new arrangements, under the shadow of overcrowding and increased prisoner movements, can improve service delivery, ensure consistency within and between prisons, focus on the needs of individual prisoners, and build on the slow but steady progress that has been made.

Young adults

"There is a need for urgent attention to young adults. Most of them come to prison with significant educational deficits, substance use and behavioural problems. Preventing or minimising reoffending in this age group is one of the key planks of public protection. The 2001 election manifesto contained a welcome promise to overhaul this part of the prison estate, and increase resources, as had been done for juveniles. This still has not happened, and young offender institutions as a whole are unable to offer the positive interventions and activities that these young people need."

HMCIP Annual Report, 2001–2

Five years on, there is still no specific strategy, and no specific standards or funding, for this group of prisoners – either in custody or on release. Indeed, there is now greater uncertainty, with the possibility that the few protections they have will disappear if provisions to end the sentence of detention in a specified young offender institution are implemented. During the year, the Inspectorate has been collating information about the experience and treatment of young adults in different kinds of prison establishment, to be published in a short thematic report.

The contrast between arrangements for juveniles and those for young adults remains marked in many establishments: though it has been considerably narrowed in establishments which have given priority to young adults' needs. The inability to occupy young adults purposefully remains the most common failing. In the eight closed designated young offender institutions (YOIs) that we inspected during the year, only three were performing satisfactorily against this test. Surprisingly, one of those was Feltham, in spite of the fact that it was a split site with juveniles, and operated essentially as a remand prison, with an average length of stay of only 11 days for sentenced young adults. By contrast, three training prisons, dedicated solely to young adults, were not performing sufficiently well. Times of transition were particularly difficult for establishments: at the time of the inspection, Swinfen Hall had received 300 extra prisoners, before there had been a commensurate increase in regime activities.

“ There was too little work and what there was tended to be menial, with too few vocational qualifications to help prisoners gain employment on release. ” [Rochester]

All but one of the adult male local prisons holding young adults were unable to provide sufficient activity; and the two within the high security estate, Belmarsh and Woodhill, were judged to be performing poorly. At Parc, the differential between the 346 young adults, nearly all of them sentenced, and the 28 juveniles, was marked. Overall in our surveys, only 40% of young adults said that their job or vocational training would help them on release; and only around half believed that they had done anything which would reduce their chances of reoffending.

Resettlement and rehabilitation for young adults is compromised by the considerable distances from home of the establishments where they are held. This has increased with growing population pressure; and fewer than half of young adults surveyed said that they knew where to get help to find accommodation, drug treatment or continuing education. Nevertheless, six of the nine designated YOIs inspected were assessed as performing reasonably well in resettlement, and the one open YOI, Thorn Cross, was performing well.

Given the volatility of this age-group, and the insufficiency of purposeful activity, it was commendable that six of the nine designated YOIs were providing a broadly safe environment. There were, however, some concerns. Nearly a third of young people said they had felt unsafe at some time, and this varied greatly: from 54% at Woodhill to 23% at Moorland. This was particularly pronounced in split-site establishments holding juveniles. Anti-bullying arrangements were unsatisfactory in some establishments, and in all split sites holding both under- and over-18s they were worse for the latter group. This differential was evident even when the establishment had unitary monitoring and management arrangements. By contrast, three of the four dedicated 18–21 training establishments had good arrangements in place.

Similar differentials were found in relation to the use of force. At each of the dedicated 18–21-year-old establishments, and at Thorn Cross open YOI, it was not found to be excessive. There were, however, concerns at some of the mixed establishments, especially at Moorland, where two-thirds of incidents had involved young adults, though they accounted for only a third of the population.

“ Two-thirds of incidents of force involved young adults. Twenty per cent of those we looked at resulted from incidents that appeared to have been inappropriately dealt with by officers. ” [Moorland]

Five of the nine designated YOIs provided a reasonably respectful environment. One that did not was Doncaster, where the living conditions for young adults in particular were described as “squalid”, reflecting a widespread lack of attention to the needs of this group, some of whom were spending substantial periods of their sentence there. By contrast, at Feltham, young people were encouraged to maintain high standards of cleanliness.

It was noticeable this year, as previously, that the open establishment at Thorn Cross, the only dedicated open YOI in the country, scored particularly well on all of our indicators, and in the perceptions of young people themselves.

Young adults remain a group whose needs have not been systematically addressed over the last five years, in spite of their evident needs and their high reoffending rates. During the year, the National Offender Management Service has established a working group to examine the needs of young adults. We welcome this development, and will feed in the findings of our own short thematic report.

Juveniles

"It is the plight of children that alarms us most, not least because of the conditions in which they are held in Prison Service establishments. There is no evidence that the Prison Service has acknowledged the Children Act 1989 as having any relevance to them. The Prison Service should be closely integrated with those who have responsibilities in the community – probation, social services, colleges and voluntary organisations – so that there may be closer co-operation and co-ordination in meeting their needs in the community, on custody and on release."

Young prisoners, 1997

The Inspectorate's thematic review on young prisoners was produced at a time when there had been a sudden rise, to 2,643, in the number of under-18s in prisons. It recommended that children should not be held in prisons, and that a separate and joined-up youth justice framework should be created. It was followed by the Utting report, *People like us*, which expressed similar concerns.

By the time of my first annual report, in 2001–2, the Youth Justice Board had been created, as a response to these concerns. It took responsibility for preventive, custodial and community work with children involved in crime: with the aim of minimising the use of custody and maximising training input and community support. The 2001–2 annual report welcomed the overall approach, and the additional resources; but expressed concern about the number of children in prison, the standard of care in some inappropriate settings (particularly large establishments and units) and the treatment of girls and children on remand. Subsequently, the Inspectorate established a dedicated juvenile team, which carries out inspections of juvenile establishments jointly with Ofsted; and we then published specific *Expectations* on the care and treatment of children in prison.

Our concerns were underlined in a joint chief inspectors' review of children's safeguards in 2002. The findings of inspection reports contributed to the landmark judgement in a case brought by the Howard League, which established that the Children Act did apply to children in prison, subject only to the requirements of imprisonment.

As a consequence, safeguarding arrangements, and links with local safeguarding children boards, have improved considerably; prison governors now have a statutory responsibility to safeguard and promote the welfare of children (under the Children Act 2004); and the relevant Prison Service Order has been redrafted.

“ The arrangements for safeguarding were good and vulnerable young people were identified and managed through multidisciplinary action planning. A newly-appointed social worker played a key role in child protection, providing an interface with local authorities in home areas, especially for young people in need and looked-after children. ”
[Warren Hill]



At the same time, the Youth Justice Board has introduced advocates and social workers into juvenile prisons. There have been some difficulties in integrating their work, while retaining a full role for residential staff; and advocates are not yet used sufficiently to support young people subject to disciplinary procedures. Though their role was still evolving, inspections found that social workers were already helping to develop safeguarding arrangements and in particular strengthen links with local authorities: including developing work with looked-after children in prison, a previously neglected group. It is therefore of great concern that there is no certainty of future funding for these posts, with the consequence that social workers are resigning or facing redundancy. It is also of concern that inspections found that retrospective enhanced Criminal Records Bureau checks were not always being carried out: at Hindley, half of the staff working with children did not have these checks.

A second joint chief inspectors' report on safeguarding in 2006 expressed concern about behaviour management, and the over-use of physical control, strip searching and segregation. We remain extremely concerned about these processes. Inspections rarely find comprehensive behaviour management policies, in which all methods of managing this challenging and sometimes volatile population are coordinated, and subject to appropriate safeguards and procedures.

Adjudications, though generally conducted in a more age-appropriate way, are over-used, partly because of the requirements of Prison Rules. Children continue to be subject to adult rules on strip searches, especially on arrival, and they are sometimes carried out by force; though most establishments have adapted local policies to reduce routine strip-searching within the establishment.

Inspections continue to record concerns about the high levels of the use of force, though in some establishments, such as Feltham, it had reduced significantly through monitoring and reviewing each use. Both the Carlile Report and the 2006 joint chief inspectors' report criticised the use of pain-compliance methods, sometimes used for failure to comply with staff instructions. In our survey, 27% of boys and 11% of girls said that they had been physically restrained. Injuries sustained during restraint are often the highest single category of child protection referrals in an establishment; but few properly monitor the injuries that arise from use of force. Nor do the Youth Justice Board or Prison Service, in spite of Inspectorate recommendations.

“ We were very concerned that force was used on children and young people who did not agree to be strip-searched. About a quarter of child protection referrals resulted from this procedure. Monitoring of use of force needed to be improved, including trend analysis. ”
[Huntercombe]

Segregation units in juvenile establishments have all been re-badged as “care and separation” or “reorientation” units. But not all have changed their focus or ethos sufficiently. Many held a varied population with different needs: bullies, victims, vulnerable young people. Care plans for

individual children were a rarity. We have continued to express concern about the use of special (unfurnished) cells for children, and it is welcome that some establishments no longer have them. Some have introduced “calm-down” facilities on the residential units. While in principle this is welcome, in practice such cells rarely provide a supportive environment, and indeed in one establishment were the equivalent of unfurnished accommodation without any of the safeguards.

The 2001–2 annual report expressed particular concern about girls, who were always held in adult female establishments; and this was reinforced in the joint thematic report produced with Ofsted in 2004, *Girls in prison*, which concluded that the system was “still failing this vulnerable and damaged group of young women”. There are now four dedicated and small girls’ units, with another due to be opened in December 2006. We inspected three of those units during the year. One was still experiencing teething difficulties, but the other two were offering good quality care to some very challenging young women. In our juvenile surveys over the last two years, published in 2006, it is clear that girls in small units report much better treatment and conditions than those held with adult women.

“ Relationships between staff and young women were very good. A key worker scheme, which was part of a wider case management model, provided young women with good individual planned care. ” [Downview]

Education and training have been central to the Youth Justice Board’s approach, and there has been considerable investment in these areas. Our surveys show that around nine out of 10 girls and eight out of 10 boys said they were in education – though few establishments have been able to meet the YJB’s original specification of 30 hours a week of purposeful activity. Standards of education remained variable across the establishments inspected by Ofsted this year. Almost all establishments had special educational needs coordinators and learning support assistants. In many cases, however, there was not enough vocational training or higher level courses for more able young people. Initial assessments of literacy and numeracy were carried out, but the results were not always used effectively to plan provision that would meet all young people’s needs. Activities were not always well-integrated, and we still found delays in some establishments in getting young people to classes.

It is disappointing that the juvenile survey results for 2006 do not show any discernible improvement since 2004 in young people’s perceptions of access to, or the value of, education. An increased focus on vocational and skills-based training is needed for young people whose experience of formal education is likely to be negative. It is of some concern that young women in our recent survey were less likely to say they had been able to learn a skill or trade than at the time of the last survey. There have, however, been considerable improvements in the educational opportunities available to remanded children, following the introduction of YJB standards in remand management.

Access to exercise in the fresh air remains a major concern. In our survey, only around half the girls and a quarter of the boys said they were able to exercise every day, and in one establishment, none said they were able to do so. Inspections during the year found that this had begun to be a scheduled activity, but there was rarely enough time or sufficient facilities. There is a clear link, as the Carlile committee reported, between the use of force and the failure to provide sufficient outlets for young people's physical energies.

One noticeable change over the last five years has been the development of more child-centred and child-appropriate cultures in juvenile establishments: with softer uniforms, routine use of first names, and some (though limited) training for staff. Three-quarters of young prisoners in our surveys said that staff treated them with respect. However, proactive personal officer work, which is a keystone to the effective management and care of young people, was still variable, and often restricted to day to day wing activities, rather than attendance at training planning or other important meetings.

The safety of children and young people in custody remains a fundamental concern. There has been progress in developing integrated safeguarding strategies, which include robust measures to prevent suicide and self-harm. There has also been progress in relation to first night and induction support, though the facilities in some establishments are inadequate. In our most recent survey, fewer young people reported having felt unsafe than in 2004. This was particularly marked for girls (dropping from 63% to 30%), and we believe this is connected to the small dedicated units in which many were held. It is still, nevertheless, the case that nearly a third of young people have felt unsafe, and, as with adults, inspections found that anti-bullying strategies were under-developed in many establishments. This needs to be part of the overall management of behaviour, referred to above.

We remain extremely concerned about the size of many juvenile establishments. Huntercombe, for example, has units which are both too large and entirely unsuitable for their purpose. As numbers have again risen in the juvenile prison estate, these units are now full, creating significant problems of safely managing and engaging with young people. Another consequence is that children are held at some distance from home: at Warren Hill, over 73% of children were over 100 miles from home. And inspections continue to highlight long journeys and late arrivals, in spite of the new contracts renegotiated in 2005. This problem has grown as the recent steep rise in the juvenile population has resulted in more children being held further away from courts and home. And our surveys show that family visits have become more difficult since 2004.

“ Young people frequently arrived after 7.30 pm and sometimes much later, often having been discharged from court many hours earlier and having endured long journeys in cramped cellular vehicles. ” [Feltham]

Finally, prisons continue to hold children and young people with serious mental health problems. This was a particular concern during the inspection of Feltham, for example, and reflects the inadequate provision for adolescents outside the prison system. Though mental health in-reach work has improved, it is insufficient to meet the need, and it is in any event inappropriate to hold mentally ill children in prison. This is a major challenge for health, as well as criminal justice, services.

The last five years have clearly seen a major change in the way young people under 18 are managed and cared for within the prison system: involving a culture shift for prisons and staff, and a significant injection of resources and multi-disciplinary support. Most of the juvenile establishments that we inspected during the year were performing satisfactorily on our key tests of safety, respect, purposeful activity and resettlement. That was far from the case five years ago.

Nevertheless, many unresolved issues remain. They include the development of safe, appropriate and properly integrated systems of behaviour management; the role of residential staff; and the need to provide better and safer accommodation for boys. Underlying these, however, is the question of whether prison is the right, or appropriate, environment for many of the young people who end up there – and in growing numbers which siphon off the resources needed to provide appropriate mental health services, and other support mechanisms and interventions, in the community.



Women

"The needs of women in prison differ in many respects from those of male prisoners. It is our strongly held view that the women's prison system ought to be managed as one entity, by one Director ... there is an urgent need for a thorough analysis of the needs of women prisoners, and for a national strategy for implementing and managing appropriate policies."

Women in prison, 1997

In 2001, a follow-up report recorded considerable progress in dealing with these issues, the most important and positive of which was the creation of a Women's Policy Group and an operational manager of women's prisons; though it also recorded that the number of women in prison had increased from 2,444 to 3,140. The Inspectorate then set up its own specialist women's team, which inspects all female establishments.

There are now 4,482 women in prison, though the population has held steady for around two years, following a steep rise in 2001–3. An unfortunate consequence of these population shifts has been the repeated rerolling of prisons to and from men and women.

This year, due to pressures on the male population, three women's prisons rerolled to take men, causing considerable disruption and distress. There is now no women's closed training prison in the north of England, and no women's prison in the West Midlands, the country's second largest conurbation. We found that moving the only women's therapeutic unit from Winchester to Send had caused considerable dislocation, and that the facility was seriously under-used. It was, however, extremely welcome to record the final closure of Durham women's prison: though not before the death of a young woman about whom inspectors were seriously concerned.

At the same time, the separate operational management of the women's estate, praised in 2001, was short-lived. In 2004, women's prisons reverted to area management. The Inspectorate has expressed considerable concern about this, noting that too often decisions about the role and location of women's prisons are based on pressures in the male estate; that good practice is not always replicated; and that the movement of women, particularly challenging women, across the estate has been more difficult. There are also no ring-fenced finances for women's prisons. The National Offender Management Service has no senior and visible champion focusing solely on women.

One of the hoped-for benefits of women's prisons returning to area management was that this would improve resettlement services, which need to be regional. It is far from clear, however, that this has happened. We found under-developed resettlement policies in all the women's prisons we inspected. We did not assess any women's prison as performing well under our resettlement test; and indeed women's prisons were the only category of prison, outside the high security estate, with more unsatisfactory than satisfactory resettlement assessments.

“ There was no clear or consistent way of measuring the outcomes for each aspect of resettlement against prisoners’ needs, and there had been no analysis of women’s parental and family status. ” [New Hall]

The distance of women from their homes and families is likely to be a factor here; and this has worsened as a result of the re-roles. But in some prisons we also found insufficient attention to housing services, which is a key priority for women; and at two establishments there was no analysis of women’s specific needs.

Sentence planning was a problem at five of the women’s prisons inspected this year, and there appeared to be greater difficulties than in men’s prisons in obtaining information needed for OASys assessments. It was welcome, however, that four offending behaviour programmes had been developed specifically for women.

Though women’s prisons are no longer separately managed, the development of policies and strategies specific to women has continued – for example, the Women’s Reoffending Reduction Programme, and the injection of significant funding for drug treatment and the reduction of offending. There has been much-improved detoxification and clinical management in the great majority of women’s prisons over recent years, though there is still a need for appropriate motivational and supportive regimes for women in the very vulnerable stage immediately after detoxification. Pre-release work, including short-term drugs programmes, and links with community drug services and programmes have also improved. These developments have undoubtedly contributed to the significant decline in self-inflicted deaths among women, referred to earlier. However, the rate of self-harm among women, particularly young women, is of serious concern, and an indication of the extreme vulnerability of some of the women held (see safer custody section).

“ Over a nine-month period, there were 1,270 recorded instances of self-harm and 10 serious suicide attempts. Women at high risk of self-harm were cared for in the healthcare centre, and the most prolific and aggressive were in segregation, often in strip clothing. ” [Bullwood Hall]

Women also have specific needs in the early days of custody, especially the 40-50% of women in local prisons who have never before been in custody. Some prisons routinely ask about the care of children; but others still do not. Styal provided an excellent example of good first night care, but, surprisingly, some other women’s local prisons continued to rely on informal arrangements.

Four of the prisons inspected had mother and baby units. We were very concerned about practices and support at Styal, but the others were working well. Askham Grange had extended this, through



an excellent and innovative family services team, working with all mothers and their children inside and outside the prison. It was the best initiative we have seen: a model of good practice that ought to be replicated in all women's prisons.

“ Excellent help with family contact and children's issues was provided through the family support team, and there was an innovative family learning programme established with the local city council and family centre. ” [Askham Grange]

It is estimated that 17,000 children a year are separated from their mothers through imprisonment. Visiting is therefore extremely important but inevitably difficult, due to distances from home. It is of some concern that around a quarter of women in our surveys reported difficulty in getting to telephones, their main form of family communication. Some women chose not to have visits from their children, and there is need for more support and training for staff, and more appropriate surroundings, to encourage them to do so.

In 2001, we criticised the closure of family visits in two women's prisons. Sadly, it was still the case this year that half the women's prisons inspected, including two training prisons, had no regular and structured family days – while Low Newton, in spite of its pressures as a busy local prison, managed to have weekly children's morning visits and longer monthly ones.

Foreign national women, who make up 20% of the female prison population, face particular difficulties in relation to family contact and preparation for release; as well as the generic problems, for all foreign nationals, of language and immigration. This was explored in more depth in the course of the work on the foreign nationals thematic (see foreign nationals section). In the 10 women's prisons inspected during the year, only one, apart from the designated foreign nationals centre at Morton Hall, had a sufficiently comprehensive and well-implemented foreign national policy. Most were developing links with Hibiscus, the voluntary sector support organisation, but this could not compensate for the lack of effective support to women on the residential units.

We have regularly raised the issue of alternatives to custody, or alternative forms of custody, for women. The ill-fated experiment of intermittent custody at Morton Hall is now being abandoned, after considerable expense. As inspections reported, take-up was inevitably low, as the prison was too far away from where the majority of women offenders lived; and work and rehabilitation opportunities were unsatisfactory. Pilot schemes for community support centres are now being developed; so far, five have been commissioned in Yorkshire and Humberside and the north west, though funding is not secure beyond 2009.

The last five years have seen the recognition that women prisoners have particular needs and vulnerabilities, which need to be supported by specific policies and practices. The containment of the women's prison population, at a time of unprecedented rises in other

areas, and the decline in the number of self-inflicted deaths, are welcome – though the levels of self-harm, and the use of force to prevent deaths, indicate that the underlying problems that lead to such deaths are not yet being effectively tackled. The development of women-specific policies has continued, for example in relation to substance use. However, in the absence of any specific operational budgetary and management arrangements, or a clear and visible policy lead within NOMS, the small women’s population is extremely vulnerable to the needs and demands in the rest of the prison system. It is also more difficult to swiftly develop and implement coherent and consistent practices and alternatives.

Race equality

“While there is a willingness to tackle race in most prisons, those responsible often lack the time, training or understanding to do so effectively. Prisons will only be able to comply with their duties under the Race Relations Act if diversity issues are at the heart of the prison’s management and structures, if those investigating complaints are properly trained and supported, and if prisons actively use the information they receive from complaints and monitoring.”

HMCIP Annual Report 2001–2

Since 2001, the Prison Service has been under detailed examination in relation to race relations. In 2003, the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) found the Service guilty of unlawful discrimination in its inquiry into events at Brixton, Parc and Feltham, and a joint action plan was produced. At the same time, the Inspectorate began work on a thematic review to monitor and chart progress. In 2006, the judicial inquiry into the death of Zahid Mubarek found evidence of “institutional religious discrimination”, and made further recommendations.

There has undoubtedly been progress in the five years since 2001. Inspections now find that public sector prisons have in place mechanisms to manage and monitor race equality, including most recently a requirement to make impact assessments of all policies and practices. Ethnic monitoring and complaints systems have in general improved.

It is of concern, however, that this was not the case in the two contracted-out prisons inspected during the year, Parc and Doncaster: and in the former it was of particular concern that there was no evidence of an action plan to deal with issues raised in the CRE inquiry. Contracted-out prisons do not seem sufficiently aware of their positive duty to promote good race relations, under the Race Relations Act. This is an issue that regional offender managers will need to address.

“ Impetus in race relations had slowed considerably. There was no evidence of an action plan to deal with issues raised in the recent critical CRE investigation. Ethnic monitoring was limited and there was no record of previous years’ racial incident investigations. ” [Parc]

In spite of the improvements, our prisoner surveys routinely recorded that the perceptions of black and minority ethnic (BME) prisoners were poorer than those of white prisoners in all areas of prison life, with two exceptions: the uptake and value of education, and respect for religious belief. The latter is a new finding, and seems to reflect the progress in multi-faith work and partnership now evident in prison chaplaincies. The best outcomes for BME prisoners were in the high security estate and in women’s prisons; the worst were in young adult establishments, where BME young people were least likely to say that they were treated with respect, and the most likely to report having felt unsafe.

It should be of some concern to NOMS that across all functional types of prison, BME prisoners reported significantly worse outcomes in relation to resettlement, and those perceptions were particularly marked for Asian prisoners (see Appendix 8).

Inspections also continue to raise some of the same concerns as in 2001: including deficiencies in management and leadership and a need for more staff training. Nevertheless, there were also examples of creative practice: such as the use of peer supporters at Coldingley, and links with the CRE and local race equality councils at Whitemoor and Blundeston.

“ Prisoner diversity orderlies had job descriptions and liaised between prisoners and staff to resolve diversity matters affecting prisoners. They were supervised weekly and had their own office. ” [Coldingley]

Some further issues were raised by inspections this year. First, it will be important to ensure that the growing diversity agenda does not detract from the attention that still needs to be paid to race equality. Second, some prisons are still struggling with the positive duty to promote race equality, and trying to build impact assessments and prisoner consultation into their routine way of doing business. Finally, and importantly, the issue of religious discrimination has taken a higher profile this year. Inspection reports, as well as the Mubarek inquiry, highlighted the fact that prisons are not always well-equipped to deal with the growing number of Muslim prisoners, and to make well-informed judgements about their needs, or any problems that are arising.

Many of the matters raised in inspection reports were examined in more depth in the thematic report *Parallel worlds*. This report aimed to assist prisons to implement the CRE/Prison Service Action Plan by identifying the barriers that still existed. Its principal finding was that there was no shared understanding of race issues in prisons, but rather that there were divergent experiences and views between visible minority and white prisoners and between BME and white staff. Governors and race relations managers had a more optimistic view than visible minority prisoners. White staff were often unaware of the experiences and problems of BME colleagues – who themselves often felt they lacked support from senior managers in progressing the race agenda.

Among prisoners, there were different primary concerns. Asian prisoners (particularly young Asians) were more likely to feel unsafe; and black prisoners less likely to feel respected. This year's surveys, however, do not show those differentials. Black and Asian prisoners report virtually the same perceptions (around 40% in both groups having felt unsafe, and only two-thirds saying that staff treated them with respect). However, Asian prisoners still report much higher levels of racist bullying, both by staff and prisoners.

“ The Prison Service and the CRE should address the key areas for development identified by the Inspectorate in *Parallel worlds*, in managing the action plan which the Prison Service and CRE have produced. ” [Mubarek inquiry, recommendation 79]

The thematic report identified a number of areas for development, in implementing the CRE/Prison Service Action Plan. These included mechanisms to deal with the report’s findings about prisoners’ experience and perceptions; improved training; more effective leadership and management; the recruitment and support of BME staff; better procedures and processes; more prisoner consultation and communication; healthcare that reflects BME needs; and the promotion of race equality as required by the Race Relations Act, including in contracted-out prisons.

These are all areas that were highlighted as important in 2001. It is therefore welcome that one of the recommendations of the Mubarek inquiry was that they should be taken forward by the Prison Service and the CRE in implementing their action plan.

Foreign nationals

"The institutional blind spot for foreign nationals is evident from the fact that most prisons had no specific foreign national work and many did not know how many they held until inspectors informed them. This was not helped by the dilatory attitude of the Immigration Service, which, unless pressed, was not monitoring those liable to deportation and making arrangements for this to take place as soon as sentence had expired."

HMCIP Annual Report 2002–3

For the last five years, inspection reports have highlighted the lack of consistent Prison Service standards for the care and management of foreign nationals, who now make up 13% of the prison population; reports have also criticised the poor liaison, support and communication from the immigration authorities. For that reason, we undertook a thematic review into the care and management of foreign national prisoners during 2005–6. In April 2006, this issue became a matter of major public concern, when it emerged that foreign nationals had been released from prison without proper consideration of deportation.

Inspections during the year continued to reveal systemic problems. As last year, a third of prisons undergoing full inspections had no foreign national prisoner policy, and few of those which had such policies were able to demonstrate effective implementation. Even where there was attention to foreign nationals, this sometimes related only to immigration matters, which was the sole focus of the existing Prison Service Order. Yet contact with immigration authorities was insufficient in most prisons: some had surgeries run by the Immigration and Nationality Directorate (IND), but they were insufficient to meet need or to answer prisoner and staff queries. In only eight prisons were inspectors able to identify consistently good outcomes.

“ A checklist ensured consistent information was given. This included the location and identity of orderlies, immigration surgeries, how to order newspapers, disability, racism and bullying issues and planned activities. Forms were distributed to all new arrivals asking about their nationality, language spoken, if they needed to talk to an orderly in confidence or needed any help. ” [Coldingley]

Foreign national women, who are one in five of the female prison population, have particular problems in relation to family contact, and it was therefore of concern that so many of the women's prisons inspected had no, or ineffective, policies (see section on women). Indeed, the provision at Styal, which held 62 foreign nationals from 17 countries, had deteriorated since 2003.

The thematic review produced further evidence of these systemic failings and provided a powerful evidence base for the need for a fundamental change of attitude. The research identified three primary concerns for foreign nationals: family contact, immigration and language. Though most

staff were aware of these problems, few realised their seriousness, and staff also lacked guidance and knowledge about how to deal with them. Black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners were more likely to report discriminatory treatment, while those who did not speak English, or had not lived in this country, had the most problems. Worryingly, young prisoners were least likely to appreciate the problems they faced.

Both staff and prisoners were extremely frustrated at the lack of support and contact from the immigration authorities. In all 10 of the fieldwork prisons, staff complained that the formal channels of communication with IND's Criminal Casework Team were ineffective and wasted time. Cases were often acted on at the last minute, with no warning or possibility of preparation. This was exacerbated by the fact that little independent legal advice was available for those facing removal or deportation.

“ In all ten prisons, staff complained that the formal channels of communication with immigration were ineffective and wasted their time. It was difficult to get through, the hotline did not work, messages went unanswered, faxes disappeared, staff kept changing with no one taking responsibility. ” [Foreign national prisoners: a thematic review, 2006]

In relation to preparation for release, foreign nationals reported significantly poorer support and sentence planning than British nationals. Links with statutory services, such as probation, were sometimes ineffective, with consequences for public protection.

Since April 2006, many more ex-offenders have been detained in prisons by IND after the end of sentence; and some who had been living law-abiding lives in the community after their release from prison were arrested and re-detained. This has placed further pressure on an already overcrowded prison estate. Notices of intention to deport were issued without any consideration of individual circumstances: in some cases to people who were British, and in others to people not liable to deportation, or who had decades of residence in the UK and had not committed serious offences. These were not then swiftly followed up, so that many detainees remained in prisons or immigration removal centres without further information, access to legal advice or action, even when they wished to be returned home. Continuing contact with the immigration authorities remained a major problem in many prisons during the early autumn. The human cost, and the effect on the safety of prisons and prisoners, was considerable, and there was evidence of a rise in self-harm among foreign nationals.

This serves to emphasise the need for consistent, humane and reliable systems within both prison and immigration services. Failure to consider deportation in some cases was only one symptom of the lack of such systems. The proper care and treatment of foreign national prisoners is of equal concern, as is the making of defensible and early immigration decisions and ensuring effective communication with prisons and prisoners. Five years on, the problems that have subsequently ensued underline the need for our recommendations to be implemented as a matter of urgency.

Close supervision centres, segregation and dispersal prisons

"In practice, within the CSC system, those who fail to progress, which has proved to be the majority, are consigned to various degrees of restriction, with a significant proportion experiencing open-ended, long-term segregation in conditions that equate to punishment."

Close supervision centres, 2000

The 2000 Inspectorate thematic report on close supervision centres (CSCs) recommended an integrated model of care and control with opportunities for progression for the most disruptive prisoners in the prison system held in CSCs. It also recommended greater oversight for Boards of Visitors (now IMBs).

Subsequent inspectorate reports also expressed some concern about dispersal prisons. While recognising the challenging nature of their population, and the difficult balances to be struck between care and control, inspections found relationships to be too distant in some dispersal prisons. Most lacked sufficient purposeful activity, or resettlement planning; and there was insufficient planning for the growing population of older prisoners. There were particular concerns about the operation of high security segregation units, between which difficult and disruptive prisoners were passed in what was called the "merry-go-round"; and where all the self-inflicted deaths in dispersal prisons had taken place in 2002–4.

There have been significant developments in these areas over the last few years. The changes in the CSC system and in high security segregation were charted in a thematic report, *Extreme custody*, published in 2006.

This report recorded considerable progress within the CSC system. Numbers had reduced by about 15%, and there were more opportunities for progression and pathways out of the system. The punishment unit, criticised in the previous thematic report, had been closed. There was more forensic mental health support, and an exceptional risk unit catered for those few prisoners who were too dangerous to be unlocked together. There were some concerns: the need for more activities for those in solitary confinement, a need for better day-to-day external monitoring and, in particular, the disruption to care and management caused by transfers to designated CSC cells outside the main units.

“ This report charts the progress that has been made – some of it innovative – in dealing with prisoners in the most extreme forms of custody within our prison system; though it also points out the distance still to travel. ” [*Extreme custody*, 2006]

There had also been progress in high security segregation units, under a new Prison Service Order. This had effectively ended the 'merry-go-round' and put in place stronger systems of oversight and monitoring. The thematic report recorded a decrease in the number of short-stay prisoners in the segregation system. However, the number of prisoners held for longer periods had increased, partly because they were not moving between establishments, but also because they represented a core of extremely disturbed prisoners whose needs, particularly for mental health support, were not being met.

Staff-prisoner relationships were becoming more positive in some units, with noticeable improvements in Wakefield and Whitemoor; and there were regular reviews of segregation. There were still, however, insufficient activities, and inconsistencies between units in relation to regimes, routines and the use of special cells. There was also a need to reinforce and encourage culture change.

These improvements, while welcome, indicate the need for effective management of the most hidden parts of the prison system and the acute needs of many of those held in segregation. The ring-fencing of the high security estate's segregation units may have displaced some of these problems to even less well-resourced units in other prisons. It is therefore welcome that a review of segregation in general, particularly the mental health needs of segregated prisoners, is now being undertaken by the Prison Service.

All five dispersal prisons were inspected during the year. Frankland remained the best-performing of the five, and had improved since the last inspection; there had also been improvements at Wakefield. However, we did not consider that any of them were performing well in relation to purposeful activity or resettlement, though there had been some progress.

There were also concerns about the superficial and distant staff-prisoner relationships at most of these prisons, and about the weakness of personal officer schemes – for which there is less excuse in prisons that hold prisoners for long periods. There were particular concerns about staff attitudes and engagement at Whitemoor and Wakefield.

“ We had serious concerns about the quality and extent of staff relationships with prisoners. Too often, we found wing staff in their offices, watching day-time television. Prisoners were often spoken to behind bars, or ignored. ” [Whitemoor]

“ We still found far too many staff in offices while prisoners were out of their cells, an ineffective personal officer scheme and little support on the wings for prisoners engaged in offending behaviour programmes. ” [Wakefield]

All the dispersal prisons except for one, Full Sutton, were assessed as performing satisfactorily on safety, which is commendable, given the nature of their prisoners. However, in all the prisons except Frankland we did not believe that sufficient work was being done to tackle bullying, in the sophisticated forms it can take in dispersal prisons.

We were particularly critical of the inadequate sanitary arrangements at Long Lartin, noting that the grounds were littered with excrement thrown from cell windows. There were criticisms of healthcare services and the support available to foreign nationals at all the dispersals except Full Sutton.

We commended the often innovative work done in the new specialist units: those for dangerous and severely personality disordered (DSPD) prisoners at Frankland and Whitemoor and the new CSC at Whitemoor. The unit holding men detained for alleged terrorist offences at Long Lartin, however, needed further development, to provide an adequate regime and proper support for this small group of prisoners.

There has been progress in dispersal prisons over the last five years, particularly in relation to the management of the most difficult and dangerous prisoners in CSCs and segregation. There has also been greater attention to providing activity for men who will spend long periods in prison, and also to resettlement, which for these prisoners means planning for progression through sentence. However, more could be done in these areas.

Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners

“A system which was designed to cope with less than 1,000 lifers is now struggling to meet in excess of 4,000. The current lifer management system is not working well...no single unit/department is responsible for ensuring that sentence management for lifers is centrally directed.”

Lifers, 1999

Following the joint thematic report on lifers by this Inspectorate and the inspectorate of probation, additional places for lifers were created and their allocation, transfer and reviews were passed to a single lifer unit. As a consequence, fewer lifers backed up in local prisons, and life sentence planning improved.

Seven years later, there are 8,000 prisoners serving indeterminate sentences – and the processes for managing and progressing them through the prison system have once again deteriorated. With the advent of NOMS, central management of lifers again became fragmented. This was exacerbated by the growth in lifer numbers and in particular the introduction of the new indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP), whose use greatly exceeded initial expectations.

There are now delays in the transfer of lifers and indeterminate-sentenced prisoners throughout the system. By September 2006, there were over 1,400 IPP prisoners, around three-quarters of whom were still held in local prisons, unable to progress through sentence or to participate in work that would reduce their risk by the time of tariff expiry (one in five had tariffs of 18 months or less). In one local prison, we found 55 indeterminate-sentenced prisoners, some of whom had been there for over 12 months. They included 51 IPP prisoners, many with very short tariffs.

“ Thirty category C life-sentenced prisoners were waiting to move to other prisons where their offending behaviour needs could be met but there were increasingly long waits and some prisoners had been waiting for several months. ” [Kingston]

There has also been confusion and misunderstanding about life sentence planning, following the introduction of OASys, which is not yet fully suitable for risk assessing lifers. We found significant delays in initial assessments in many prisons.

During the year, we inspected three dedicated lifer prisons: Gartree, Kingston and Shepton Mallet. All were experiencing difficulties in fulfilling this specialised role, and it was unclear how this fitted into the regional resettlement strategies being developed by regional offender managers. Gartree’s own internal processes for the assessment of early-stage lifers had also deteriorated significantly. Kingston had not entirely come to terms with its changed population, which included younger and shorter-tariff prisoners.

In all three prisons, there was insufficient purposeful work and training for men who would spend considerable periods marking time in the prison system before they would be able to move on to the next stage of sentence.

“ Purposeful activity was insufficient in both quantity and quality, with too little emphasis on work, vocational training and education to meet the immediate and longer-term needs of life-sentenced prisoners. ” [Shepton Mallet]

Lifer management in other, less specialised prisons was variable. Some, like Coldingley and Moorland, were doing well, with up-to-date reviews and good administrative processes. Others, like Blundeston, had fallen behind.

The last five years have therefore seen a depressingly circular movement: from a system unable to cope with the unexpected pressure of 4,000 indeterminate-sentenced prisoners to one equally unfit to deal with twice that number. The inability to progress these prisoners properly through the system is both a casualty of, and a contributor to, our overcrowded prisons.



Resettlement

"There is no overall resettlement strategy, and the resettlement needs of many prisoners are being severely neglected. Changes are needed in the systems, approaches and priorities of both the prison and probation services to support cooperative and targeted work."

Through the prison gate, 2001

Resettlement is one of the areas that has changed most significantly over the last five years. In 2001, there was no consistent, coherent or joined-up approach to identifying and meeting the resettlement needs of prisoners, or to managing offenders through prison and afterwards. Now, resettlement and the case management of offenders is a core priority, both within prisons and in the concept of a National Offender Management Service (NOMS). Inspection of resettlement has changed to reflect these new priorities and structures. We have revised our inspection criteria and will also be participating in offender management inspection, across prisons and probation, with the probation inspectorate.

The thematic report's call for a strategic focus on resettlement was reflected in a Prison Service Order in 2001 and in the National Reducing Reoffending Action Plan of 2004 (and the delivery plan of November 2005): which set out seven resettlement "pathways". All NOMS regions were meant to complete regional plans by April 2005, though several did not meet this deadline. Some prison management teams nevertheless used the resettlement pathways to develop or update local strategies; while others simply waited, with consequent delays and gaps in resettlement provision.

This year, inspections found that some prisons still did not have a current resettlement strategy, and most did not have one that covered the specific needs of all the prisoner groups in their population. Though some needs analysis had been carried out, in general there was insufficient objective analysis and poor use of data. Management structure and practices remained weak: many inspection reports referred to a lack of strategic focus in the prison's resettlement policy committee.

There were particular concerns about some contracted-out prisons, which in some areas were left adrift from regional strategies; and high security prisons, even those that operated mainly as local prisons, were slow to develop and implement strategies.

“ In order to be meaningful as the primary reference point for all decisions affecting the prisoner, sentence planning should be fully integrated with other processes. ” [Parkhurst]

NOMS is based on the case management approach advocated in the 2001 thematic report. At present, though, that is a hope rather than a reality within prisons. Prisoners continued to

undergo a large number of interviews and assessments, but their results were rarely coordinated and followed through consistently during sentence. Plans were drawn up (though not always for those serving short sentences) but no individual was responsible for ensuring that they were followed, or for monitoring progress against targets set. Targets were often not shared with key personnel and sentence plans were not routinely used to inform key decisions about how the prisoner would spend time in custody. By next year, prisons should have in place offender management units to remedy some of these problems, and some were starting to be planned during this year.

“ Identified staff should be responsible for ensuring that agreed targets for individual prisoners are being achieved. ” [Northallerton]

Personal officers, the only key workers for prisoners at present, were rarely involved in sentence management, and entries in prisoners' history sheets reflected this. Our surveys showed that in local prisons only 26% of prisoners found their personal officer helpful; this rose to 53% in women's and dispersal prisons. Too often, responsibility for meeting planned targets effectively remained with the prisoner.

There were in general more structured approaches to managing prisoners subject to public protection measures; though some weaknesses remained. Though procedures existed, staff training and awareness was often insufficient. A joint thematic report conducted with the police and probation inspectorates found some significant weaknesses, particularly in record-keeping and in the management of those who denied their offences.

The 2001 thematic report also stressed the need for better liaison between prisons and probation: once again, a founding principle of NOMS. This remained a weakness. The roll-out of the joint assessment tool, OASys, was hampered by factors such as inadequate resourcing or priority in some prisons, under-estimation of the work involved, and the inability to exchange information between prisons and probation IT systems (or indeed between public and private sector prisons). Links between prisons and probation were weak in many prisons, with limited input from, or liaison with, prisoners' home probation areas; though there were some examples of good practice.

“ Many prisoners' families and outside probation officers attended sentence planning reviews. ” [Kirklevington Grange]

“ Sentence planning boards were arranged on time by personal officers but had not been regularly attended by home probation officers. ” [Swinfen Hall]

Together with the probation inspectorate, we have been piloting inspection of offender management across prisons and probation: though the slow start to offender management and



the decision not to implement Custody Plus at present have limited prisons' contribution. Pilot inspections have uncovered weaknesses: for example, OASys assessments not reaching prisons. Joint offender management inspection case sampling in prisons will be taking place in 2007–8, when offender management units should exist; and this will feed into and be informed by the inspection of resettlement and the resettlement pathways in individual prisons.

The role of voluntary and community organisations in resettlement services was stressed in the thematic report. They are now more routinely involved in the delivery of reintegration services, in particular. However, inspections found that provision was patchy and long-term funding uncertain (particularly with the ending of European Social Fund support). Nor were these services always well coordinated, to ensure that they were complementary and an integral part of the prison's overall provision.

Liaising with community services is much more difficult when prisoners come from outside the prison's own area: training prisons in the south and east, for example, had difficulties in meeting the needs of the often sizeable number of London prisoners, where housing and probation support was often most difficult to find. This was reflected in our prisoner surveys. The number of truly "through the prison gate" services remained small, and were most likely to be found where prisoners were held close to home and where regional strategies were strong. It is noticeable, for example, that of all the local prisons inspected, prisoner survey responses on reintegration were best at Parc, where the Welsh authorities and the Welsh Director of Offender Management were working closely together – and worst at Belmarsh, which was part of the nationally-managed high security estate.

“ Parc had made real and visible progress in resettlement, with the active support of community and national resources outside the prison. There was a post-release mentoring scheme for some of those on drug programmes. ” [Parc]

“ There were still no effective custody or rehabilitation plans for the short-term and remanded prisoners who formed the bulk of the population. ” [Belmarsh]

The needs of short-term prisoners – who have the greatest resettlement needs, but receive the least help – were a particular concern in the thematic review. More prisons now draw up custody plans for such prisoners (even though it is not a requirement), but inspection reports still routinely found that, even where this was done, it involved a flurry of activity on the prisoner's arrival, and little if any follow-up until two to three weeks before release. This was a concern in training prisons, as well as locals, as they hold an increased number of short-term prisoners. There were examples of good practice, such as Hull's prisoner passport system, but they were exceptions. It is of concern that offender management under NOMS will not include all short-term prisoners, with the risk that they will have even less priority in commissioning and service level agreements.

Access to relevant and timely interventions and programmes, another key element of effective resettlement planning, has been adversely affected by prisoner numbers. The provision of interventions has been rationalised, with the aim that prisoners should transfer to appropriate prisons when they need to; but this was often unrealistic given population pressures. Some prisons had hundreds of prisoners queuing up for courses they would be unable to take before release; others were holding prisoners, such as sex offenders, who were unable to transfer to prisons running the programmes they needed.

Some prisons were, nevertheless, offering innovative schemes to increase prisoners' motivation to participate in interventions, and to provide post-release mentoring support. More structured pre-release programmes were available, and popular with prisoners, though here as elsewhere there was little evidence of formal follow-up arrangements post-release to help assess their value.

It is important for the resettlement task of prisons that there are structured and supported opportunities for prisoners, particularly long-term prisoners, to re-engage with the outside world during sentence. It is not clear that this forms part of the NOMS strategy.

For those in closed prisons, we have frequently commented on the under-use of release on temporary licence for resettlement purposes; and the use of tagging significantly declined during the reporting year.

Open and resettlement prisons can play a key role, particularly for long-sentenced prisoners, in providing structured support and gradual reintegration before release. However, that role has been under considerable pressure with current levels of overcrowding; nor was it always clear that it fitted into regional reoffending strategies.

Open prisons were struggling with a more varied and short-term population for which their focus and staffing levels were ill-suited. This was not helped by the fact that three of the four open prisons inspected this year had not assessed the needs of their current population: for example, the 30% of foreign nationals at Ford, or the short-term prisoners at Hewell Grange. Regimes in these prisons had in general improved, but were not consistently contributing towards the overall resettlement strategy. Some still had few prisoners working out in the community.

“ Ford lacked an adequate and sufficiently comprehensive resettlement strategy to underpin all the work of the establishment and address the range of needs that prisoners now presented. ”

“ There was an excellent resettlement policy, well-applied sentence planning and a good range of external work, education and training places. There was a whole-prison approach and it was clear that prison staff were committed to the task. ” [Kirklevington Grange]



By contrast, the one resettlement prison inspected, Kirklevington, was a model of what should be provided. Preparation for release was integral to the whole regime; large numbers of prisoners worked outside with external community partners, some of whom wanted to retain them after release; earned community visits allowed prisoners to spend time with their families. Ninety-five per cent of prisoners there believed that they had been helped not to reoffend.

We have commented equally favourably in previous years on the work done at one of the other three resettlement prisons, Blantyre House. A key recommendation of the inspection report into Kirklevington was for NOMS to examine and evaluate this work with a view to replicating it elsewhere.

It is clear that the two pillars of the 2001 thematic report – end-to-end case management and the centrality of resettlement – are integral to the NOMS vision. It is far less clear that the structures and resources are in place to ensure that this vision is translated into reality. These and other concerns expressed in last year’s annual report (including the needs of short-term and remanded prisoners and niche populations such as indeterminate-sentenced prisoners and women) remain live. Indeed they have been greatly heightened by the expansion of the prison population, which looks set both to reduce regional offender managers’ options when they commission services, and to increase the difficulty of managing prisoners effectively through the system.

Immigration detention

"Perceptions of safety were not high anywhere; detainees' insecurity was heightened by the fact that they were unable to obtain reliable information about their cases or access competent independent legal advice. Staff in most centres were not sufficiently alert to, or trained in, the specific needs of detainees. In all centres, there was insufficient constructive activity. There was no specific provision for detainees' welfare needs to deal with practical issues arising from detention, release or removal."

"The detention of children should be an exceptional measure and not exceed a very short period... the welfare and development of children is likely to be compromised by detention, however humane the provisions."

Extracts from findings in immigration removal centres, 2002

These extracts were among the findings of our first series of inspections of immigration detention facilities. Since then, we have established a specialist immigration team, carrying out a regular programme of inspections of immigration removal centres and, more recently, extending this to short-term holding facilities and escorts, which have been added to our statutory remit.

We have also published specific *IRC Expectations*: criteria for inspecting immigration detention. Following this, the Immigration and Nationality Directorate (IND) published a set of standards to supplement the Detention Centre Rules and seek to ensure consistent policies and treatment. Centres have developed policies on suicide and self-harm, anti-bullying, race relations and complaints. However, inspections found that supporting structures, including monitoring, and staff training were often deficient; and that there was both a more mixed, and a more vulnerable, population. This year has seen three self-inflicted deaths of immigration detainees.

This year, detainees were, if anything, more anxious than before about the progress of their cases. There has been a continuing reduction in the availability of suitable legal advice and representation, though recently the Legal Services Commission has begun piloting legal advice surgeries. At the same time on-site immigration teams have been reorganised and downgraded.

The detention of children remains a major concern, especially as over 2,000 children were detained over the last recorded 12-month period. Inspections have recorded some improvements in welfare provision for detained children. Centres had child protection policies, enhanced criminal records checks, some education provision and links with local authorities.

“ Yarl’s Wood held 32 children, seven of whom had been there more than 28 days. There was still no evidence that children’s welfare was taken into account when making decisions about initial and continued detention. Interviews with children vividly illustrated the effect of sudden arrest and detention and the extent of their fears and anxieties. ”

A local authority social work post had been established at Yarl’s Wood. However, these procedures still needed development, and more trained and qualified staff. Crucially, independent assessments of children’s welfare and needs were not made, either initially or after a period in detention, in order to inform decisions to detain or to maintain detention. A survey of children held at Yarl’s Wood revealed the often traumatic effect of detention on them.

The length of detention in IRCs had decreased, with around half of detainees spending seven days or less in IRCs. However, more people were being detained, and there were frequent moves around the detention estate. Time spent in non-residential short-term holding facilities, police cells and prisons was not recorded and this disguised the total time spent in detention. Inspections found that up to 60% of detainees had spent time in police stations, but that this was not properly recorded on files. We came across detainees who had been moved six or seven times between different custodial settings, without explanation. Documentation about detainees had improved, with the introduction of a risk assessment checklist and a detainee transferable document to which information can be added; however these documents were too often blank or minimally completed, even for detained children.

A particular problem highlighted in inspection reports, and confirmed in the inquiry into the healthcare provision at Yarl’s Wood, was the inadequate use of procedures to alert the authorities to the fact that detention may be injurious to a detainee’s health, under Rule 35 of the Detention Centre Rules. Healthcare staff lacked specific training to recognise and understand signs of trauma or previous torture. Even when such information was provided, we could find no evidence in any IRC that this had been systematically filed, monitored, responded to or followed up by IND.

“ No central record of Rule 35 letters was kept and there appeared to be no follow-up. Immigration staff who forwarded these letters kept no central folder and said that rarely, if ever, did they receive a response from the caseholder. ” [Yarl’s Wood]

In general, we found relationships between detainees and detention custody officers to be good, with staff displaying a better understanding of those in their care. There were, however, still some training needs, for example in diversity; and it remains a concern that staff in Prison Service-run centres still insist on carrying staves, which is entirely inappropriate for the population held. More translated material was available, but the use of professional interpretation, even for confidential matters, remained low.

Inspections continue to point to the lack of sufficient purposeful activity for detainees, and the effects of this on detainees' well-being. There was creative use of the rewards scheme at some centres to provide some occupation for detainees, as well as improvements in the provision of education and PE. This was still, however, insufficient, and it is welcome that legislation in 2006 will now allow detainees to take part in paid work.

There have also been some improvements in the provision of welfare support, with some IRCs either recruiting a welfare officer or linking with external organisations. The valuable role of voluntary visitors' groups affiliated to the Association of Visitors to Immigration Detainees was now more generally recognised. However, there was still no formal welfare provision across the IRC estate to deal with the practical problems resulting from unexpected detention. This, together with little warning of removal, continued to add to detainees' anxiety.

Detainees' access to the outside world, via telephones and email, had also improved in some centres. Best practice, at Colnbrook, was to provide telephones in each room. Some IRCs were allowing detainees to retain mobile phones without cameras, and another was piloting use of the internet and email, the cheapest and most efficient means of communication – but this still had not spread beyond the pilot stage.

Our initial inspections of short-term holding facilities (STHFs) revealed some systemic problems: lack of independent oversight and supervision; facilities that were unsuitable to hold men, women and children, sometimes overnight; and difficulties in communicating with the outside world.

There have been some changes. Later inspections found that supervision by IND managers had improved; and the Independent Monitoring Boards will shortly begin regular monitoring of STHFs. G4S, the firm running most STHFs, had put in place a set of written policies and core procedures, including anti-bullying, child protection, complaints and suicide prevention policies. Detainees were also allowed to retain mobile phones without cameras; nevertheless all STHFs should have payphones and offer free telephone calls to those detained, usually unexpectedly.

We have found detention custody officers in STHFs to be generally respectful in their treatment of detainees: indeed at Stansted staff on their own initiative had converted an interview room into a child-friendly family room. However, the facilities and accommodation in most facilities inspected remained unacceptable for holding a mixed population for any length of time. We repeatedly found people spending more than 24 hours there, without adequate washing, catering or sleeping facilities, and without access to any advice or information.

“ Families and single men were held together. Basic requirements for overnight stays – blankets to keep warm, toiletries, places to stretch out – were not available in all centres; though all held detainees overnight and for up to 36 hours. ”
[Heathrow short-term holding facilities]



Our remit now also includes immigration escorts, and we conducted structured interviews with staff and detainees at Heathrow to establish their views of escort arrangements. Some detainees reported long journeys, of over five hours, without a comfort break, sometimes exacerbated by long waits outside an IRC. Most detainees reported that staff treated them appropriately, though with little engagement. These findings will inform planned routine inspections of these arrangements.

It is clear that the regular inspection of these immigration facilities over the last five years has opened them up to the outside world, and made their operation more transparent and accountable. It has also led to some significant improvements in practices and procedures within centres, and to plans for dealing with some of the repeated concerns about activity and practical support. However, some fundamental and important issues remain unaddressed. They include the regular detention of children, without proper safeguards; and the provision of accurate and up-to-date information and advice for those suddenly and often unexpectedly detained, many of whom are increasingly vulnerable. In many cases, these are matters that only IND, rather than individual centres, can address.

appendices

1. Inspections undertaken	69
2. Inspection reports published	72
3. Recommendations accepted	75
4. Outcome of recommendations	77
5. Healthy prison assessments	79
6. Healthy establishment assessments (IRCs)	81
7. Prisoner survey responses	82
8. Survey responses by ethnicity	88
9. Detainee survey responses	90
10. Expenditure	95
11. Inspectorate staff	96



Inspections undertaken

1 September 2005–31 August 2006

ESTABLISHMENT	INSPECTION DATES	TYPE OF INSPECTION
Prisons		
Albany	25–26 Oct 05	Unannounced short follow up
Askham Grange	25–27 April 06	Unannounced short follow up
Bedford	10–12 April 06	Unannounced short follow up
Belmarsh	3–7 Oct 05	Unannounced full follow up
Blakenhurst	30 Nov–3 Dec 05	Full unannounced
Blundeston	27 Feb–3 March 06	Full announced
Brixton	22 Feb–3 March 06	Unannounced full follow up
Bullwood Hall	13–15 Dec 05	Unannounced short follow up
Camp Hill	7–11 Aug 06	Full announced
Castington	12–16 June 06	Full announced & announced short follow up
Coldingley	14–18 Dec 05	Full announced
Dartmoor	13–14 Feb 06	Unannounced short follow up
Deerbolt	24–28 April 06	Full announced
Doncaster	14–18 Nov 05	Full announced
Dovegate TC	29–31 Aug 06	Unannounced short follow up
Downview	3–7 July 06	Full announced & announced short follow up
Eastwood Park	7–9 March 06	Unannounced short follow up
Erlestoke	16–18 May 06	Unannounced short follow up
Everthorpe	25–26 April 06	Unannounced short follow up
Featherstone	13–15 March 06	Unannounced short follow up
Ford	7–11 Nov 05	Full announced
Frankland	25–26 Oct 05	Unannounced short follow up
Grand Valley Canada	19–30 Sept 05	Full announced
Haverigg	21–23 Aug 06	Unannounced short follow up
Hewell Grange	3–7 April 06	Full announced
Highdown	15–19 May 06	Full announced
Hindley	26 July–4 Aug 06	Full unannounced
Hull	28–30 Nov 05	Unannounced short follow up
Huntercombe	8–12 May 06	Full announced
Isle of Man, CI	20–24 March 06	Full announced
Kingston	28 Nov–2 Dec 05	Full announced
Lancaster Castle	7–8 Nov 05	Unannounced short follow up
Leicester	21–23 Aug 06	Unannounced short follow up

Inspections undertaken 1 September 2005–31 August 2006 (continued)

ESTABLISHMENT	INSPECTION DATES	TYPE OF INSPECTION
Lincoln	12–15 Sept 05	Unannounced full follow up
Littlehey	5–7 Dec 05	Unannounced short follow up
Long Lartin	19–23 Sept 05	Unannounced full follow up
Low Newton	3–7 April 06	Full announced
Lowdham Grange	13–17 March 06	Full announced
Maghaberry, NI	10–14 Oct 05	Full announced
Magilligan, NI	10–19 May 06	Unannounced full follow up
Moorland	12–16 Dec 05	Full announced
Morton Hall	5–7 Sept 05	Unannounced short follow-up
New Hall	20–23 March 06	Unannounced short follow up
Northallerton	17–21 Oct 05	Full announced
Nova Canada	19–30 Sept 05	Full announced
Parc	9–13 Jan 06	Full announced
Pentonville	7–16 June 06	Unannounced full follow up
Risley	6–10 Feb 06	Full announced
Rochester	9–13 Jan 06	Full announced
Send	13–17 Feb 06	Full announced
Shrewsbury	19–23 June 06	Full announced
Springhill	4–7 July 06	Unannounced short follow up
Stafford	3–7 July 06	Full announced
Styal	26 Oct–4 Nov 05	Unannounced full follow up
Swaleside	11–20 Jan 06	Unannounced full follow up
Swinfen Hall	5–9 Sept 05	Full announced
Wandsworth	5–14 July 06	Unannounced full follow up
Warren Hill	31 Oct–4 Nov 05	Full announced
Wayland	5–9 June 06	Full announced
Whitemoor	30 Jan–3 Feb 06	Full announced
Wormwood Scrubs	3–4 Oct 05	Unannounced short follow up

Inspections undertaken 1 September 2005–31 August 2006 (continued)

ESTABLISHMENT	INSPECTION DATES	TYPE OF INSPECTION
Immigration removal centres		
Colnbrook IRC	12–16 Sept 05	Full announced
Harmondsworth IRC	12–21 July 06	Full unannounced
Lindholme IRC	16–20 Jan 06	Full announced
Oakington IRC	5–7 June 06	Unannounced short follow up
Yarl's Wood IRC	13–16 Feb 06	Unannounced short follow up
Short-term holding facilities		
Colnbrook	3 May 06	Unannounced
Communications House, Electric House, Lunar House	20 June 06	Unannounced
Dover Asylum Screening Centre	31 July 06	Unannounced
Gatwick North & South	2 Aug 06	Unannounced
Harwich	30 Nov 05	Unannounced
Heathrow terminals 1 to 4 & Queen's Buildings	10–13 Oct 05	Unannounced
John Lennon airport	1 June 06	Unannounced
Port of Dover	28 Feb 06	Unannounced
Portsmouth	11 Jan 06	Unannounced
Reliance House	8 Feb 06	Unannounced
Sandford House	12 May 06	Unannounced
Stansted airport	31 Jan 06	Unannounced

OTHER INSPECTIONS	INSPECTION DATES
Joint area inspections	
Greater Manchester	5–16 Sep 05
Northumbria	9–20 Jan 06
Avon & Somerset	6–17 March 06
Cleveland	19–30 June 06
Thames Valley	31 Oct–11 Nov 05
Offender management inspections	
Cheshire OMI	Week beginning 8 May 06
Lancashire OMI	Week beginning 5 May 06
Greater Manchester OMI	Week beginning 26 June 06
Cumbria OMI	Week beginning 24 July 06

Inspection reports published

1 September 2005–31 August 2006

ESTABLISHMENT	TYPE OF INSPECTION	PUBLICATION DATE
Prisons		
Albany	Unannounced short follow up	4 April 2006
Askham Grange	Unannounced short follow up	30 August 2006
Aylesbury	Unannounced full follow up	1 November 2005
Belmarsh	Unannounced full follow up	8 March 2006
Blakenhurst	Full unannounced	16 May 2006
Blundeston	Full announced	12 July 2006
Brixton	Unannounced full follow up	19 July 2006
Bronzefield	Full announced	29 November 2005
Bullwood Hall	Unannounced short follow up	1 June 2006
Coldingley	Full announced	6 June 2006
Cookham Wood	Unannounced short follow up	22 November 2005
Dartmoor	Unannounced short follow up	28 June 2006
Doncaster	Full announced	12 April 2006
Durham	Unannounced short follow up	5 September 2005
Featherstone	Unannounced short follow up	22 August 2006
Feltham	Full announced	10 November 2005
Ford	Full announced	10 May 2006
Forest Bank	Unannounced short follow up	21 December 2005
Frankland	Unannounced short follow up	11 April 2006
Full Sutton	Unannounced short follow up	7 December 2005
Gartree	Full announced	19 October 2005
Grand Valley (Canada)	Full announced	18 August 2006
Guernsey Prison	Full announced	30 November 2005
Hewell Grange	Full announced	18 August 2006
Holme House	Full announced	28 September 2005
Hull	Unannounced short follow up	25 April 2006
Hydebank Wood	Unannounced	28 October 2005
Jersey Prison	Full announced	7 March 2006
Kingston	Full announced	20 June 2006
Kirklevington Grange	Full announced	11 January 2006
Lancaster Castle	Unannounced short follow up	26 March 2006
Leeds	Unannounced full follow up	17 January 2006
Lewes	Unannounced short follow up	26 January 2006

Inspection reports published 1 September 2005–31 August 2006 (continued)

ESTABLISHMENT	TYPE OF INSPECTION	PUBLICATION DATE
Lincoln	Unannounced full follow up	15 February 2006
Littlehey	Unannounced short follow up	17 May 2006
Long Lartin	Unannounced full follow up	14 March 2006
Maghaberry Prison	Full announced	4 May 2006
Moorland	Full announced	8 August 2006
Morton Hall	Unannounced short follow up	9 March 2006
New Hall	Unannounced short follow up	25 August 2006
Northallerton	Full announced	19 April 2006
Nova (Canada)	Full announced	18 August 2006
Parc	Full announced	9 August 2006
Parkhurst	Full unannounced	23 December 2005
Prescoed	Full announced	20 September 2005
Risley	Full announced	11 July 2006
Rochester	Full announced	15 August 2006
Send	Full announced	21 July 2006
Shepton Mallet	Full announced	19 January 2006
Stocken	Full announced	28 October 2005
Styal	Unannounced full follow up	9 May 2006
Swaleside	Full announced	13 June 2006
Swansea	Full announced	20 October 2005
Swinfen Hall	Full announced	24 January 2006
Thorn Cross	Full announced	12 October 2005
Usk	Full announced	20 September 2005
The Verne	Unannounced short follow up	2 November 2005
Wakefield	Unannounced full follow up	4 October 2005
Warren Hill	Full announced	21 April 2006
Wellingborough	Unannounced short follow up	25 October 2005
Werrington	Full announced	6 January 2006
Whitemoor	Full announced	27 June 2006
Woodhill	Unannounced full follow up	7 February 2006
Wormwood Scrubs	Unannounced short follow up	15 March 2006

Inspection reports published 1 September 2005–31 August 2006 (continued)

ESTABLISHMENT	TYPE OF INSPECTION	PUBLICATION DATE
Immigration removal centres		
Colnbrook IRC	Full announced	16 March 2006
Dover IRC	Unannounced short follow up	16 December 2005
Haslar IRC	Full announced	5 October 2005
Lindholme IRC	Full announced	8 June 2006
Oakington IRC	Unannounced short follow up	15 November 2005
Yarl's Wood IRC	Unannounced short follow up	26 July 2006
Short-term holding facilities		
Birmingham International Airport, Eaton House Middlesex, Glasgow International Airport, Festival Court Glasgow	Unannounced	15 November 2005
Calais Seaport, Coquelles Freight, Coquelles Tourist	Unannounced	5 April 2006
Luton International Airport, Waterside Court Leeds, Portsmouth Continental Ferry Port, Stansted Airport	Unannounced	21 June 2006
Heathrow terminals 1 to 4 & Queen's Buildings	Unannounced	5 April 2006

Other publications

Thematic reports

<i>Juvenile Expectations</i>	17 October 2005
<i>Parallel Worlds</i>	20 October 2005
<i>Recalled Prisoners</i>	27 January 2006
<i>Women in Prison</i>	10 April 2006
<i>Detainees under escort</i>	21 June 2006
<i>Putting risk of harm in context (with HMIs Probation and Constabulary)</i>	1 September 2006
Annual report	3 March 2006

Joint criminal justice area reports

Gwent Area	7 February 2006
Thames Valley Area	13 February 2006
Northumbria Area	22 May 2006
Greater Manchester Area	30 June 2006
Avon and Somerset Area	25 July 2006

Recommendations accepted

Prisons

ESTABLISHMENT	RECOMMENDATIONS	ACCEPTED	PARTIALLY ACCEPTED	REJECTED
Dispersals				
Whitemoor	149	115 (77%)	29 (19%)	5 (3%)
Juveniles				
Werrington	127	106	19	2
Warren Hill	126	104	14	8
Total	253	210 (83%)	33 (13%)	10 (4%)
Locals				
Holme House	88	68	17	3
Swansea	148	138	10	0
Doncaster	–	–	–	–
Blakenhurst	131	98	31	2
Total	367	304 (83%)	58 (16%)	5 (1%)
Open/Semi-open				
Kirklevington Grange	56	44	10	2
Ford	100	92	7	1
Hewell Grange	–	–	–	–
Total	156	136 (87%)	17 (11%)	3 (2%)
Trainers				
Usk & Prescoed*	76	50	25	1
Gartree	144	114	23	7
Stocken	111	91	15	5
Parkhurst	116	91	23	2
Shepton Mallet	104	75	23	6
Coldingley	91	77	12	2
Kingston	94	70	21	3
Risley	165	139	23	3
Blundeston	128	118	7	3
Moorland*	164	148	15	1
Parc*	–	–	–	–
Total	1,193	973 (82%)	187 (16%)	33 (3%)

*Establishments holding more than one population type

Recommendations accepted (continued)

Prisons

ESTABLISHMENT	RECOMMENDATIONS	ACCEPTED	PARTIALLY ACCEPTED	REJECTED
Women				
Send	110	86	14	10
Bronzefield	–	–	–	–
Total	110	86 (78%)	14 (13%)	10 (9%)
Young adults				
Thorn Cross*	92	81	9	2
Feltham*	153	132	17	4
Swinfen Hall	107	90	10	7
Rochester	–	–	–	–
Northallerton	111	95	14	2
Total	463	398 (86%)	50 (11%)	15 (3%)
Prison Total	2,691	2,222 (83%)	388 (14%)	81 (3%)

*Establishments holding more than one population type

Immigration removal centres & short-term holding facilities

ESTABLISHMENT	RECOMMENDATIONS	ACCEPTED	PARTIALLY ACCEPTED	REJECTED
Haslar IRC	80	43	29	8
Colnbrook IRC	77	68	7	2
3 x French STHFs	49	31	5	13
4 x STHFs Gatwick, London City & Dover	70	39	14	17
Lindholme IRC	87	62	20	5
Heathrow STHFs	65	40	15	10
Luton/Stansted STHFs	53	32	10	11
Total	481	315 (65%)	100 (21%)	66 (14%)

Outcome of recommendations

Breakdown of recommendations which were assessed in follow-up inspection reports published 2005–6.

Prisons

ESTABLISHMENT	RECOMMENDATIONS	ACHIEVED	PARTIALLY ACHIEVED	NOT ACHIEVED
Dispersals				
Wakefield	82	27	19	36
Full Sutton	100	63	14	23
Long Lartin	85	43	21	21
Frankland	82	42	25	15
Total	349	175 (50%)	79 (23%)	95 (27%)
Locals				
Leeds	74	33	14	27
Lewes	86	52	15	19
Woodhill	167	86	29	52
Lincoln	94	45	13	36
Belmarsh	144	41	37	66
Wormwood Scrubs	93	46	18	29
Hull	92	48	25	19
Brixton	125	59	26	40
Forest Bank	62	27	17	18
Total	937	437 (47%)	194 (21%)	306 (33%)
Trainers				
Wellingborough	111	69	25	17
The Verne	76	47	12	17
Lancaster Castle	65	45	11	9
Albany	112	53	26	33
Littlehey	71	45	20	6
Swaleside	106	51	23	32
Dartmoor	85	52	22	11
Featherstone	128	66	26	36
Total	754	428 (57%)	165 (22%)	161 (21%)

Outcome of recommendations assessed in follow-up inspection reports published (prisons) (continued)

ESTABLISHMENT	RECOMMENDATIONS	ACHIEVED	PARTIALLY ACHIEVED	NOT ACHIEVED
Women				
Cookham Wood	106	70	14	22
Morton Hall	89	62	12	15
Styal	128	37	32	59
Bullwood Hall	94	34	19	41
New Hall	102	56	18	28
Askham Grange	68	36	13	19
Total	587	295 (50%)	108 (18%)	184 (31%)
Young adults				
Aylesbury	102	56 (55%)	24 (24%)	22 (22%)
Total	2,729	1,391 (51%)	570 (21%)	768 (28%)

IRCs

ESTABLISHMENT	RECOMMENDATIONS	ACHIEVED	PARTIALLY ACHIEVED	NOT ACHIEVED
Oakington	86	28	23	35
Dover	82	39	14	29
Yarl's Wood	88	27	28	33
Total	256	94 (37%)	65 (25%)	97 (38%)

Healthy prison assessments

ESTABLISHMENT	TYPE OF INSPECTION	SAFETY	RESPECT	PURPOSEFUL ACTIVITY	RESETTLEMENT
Dispersals					
Wakefield	FFU	3	2	1	3
Full Sutton	SFU	2	3	3	3
Long Lartin	FFU	3	2	3	3
Frankland	SFU	4	4	3	2
Whitemoor	FA	3	2	2	2
Juveniles					
Werrington	FA	3	3	2	3
Warren Hill	FA	3	3	2	3
Parc	FA	3	4	3	3
Thorn Cross	FA	4	4	3	4
Feltham	FA	2	3	3	4
Locals					
Holme House	FA	3	3	2	2
Swansea	FA	3	3	1	3
Leeds	SFU	2	2	2	3
Lewes	SFU	3	4	2	2
Woodhill	FFU	1	2	1	1
Lincoln	FFU	2	2	1	1
Belmarsh	FFU	3	2	1	3
Wormwood Scrubs	SFU	3	3	2	3
Hull	SFU	3	3	2	3
Brixton	FFU	3	2	2	2
Forest Bank	SFU	2	3	3	3
Doncaster	FA	2	2	2	2
Blakehurst	FU	3	3	3	3
Open					
Prescoed	FA	4	3	4	3
Ford	FA	3	2	3	2
Moorland	FA	3	2	3	3
Hewell Grange	FA	4	3	3	3
Kirklevington Grange	FA	4	4	3	4

Numeric:

1	Performing poorly
2	Not performing sufficiently well
3	Performing reasonably well
4	Performing well

Type of inspection:

FFU	Full follow up
SFU	Short follow up
FA	Full announced
FU	Full unannounced

Healthy prison assessments (continued)

ESTABLISHMENT	TYPE OF INSPECTION	SAFETY	RESPECT	PURPOSEFUL ACTIVITY	RESETTLEMENT
Trainer					
Usk	FA	4	3	4	3
Gartree	FA	2	3	2	2
Wellingborough	SFU	3	3	2	2
Stocken	FA	3	2	1	3
The Verne	SFU	2	3	3	3
Parkhurst	FU	2	2	1	3
Shepton Mallet	FA	4	3	2	4
Lancaster Castle	SFU	4	3	2	4
Albany	SFU	3	2	3	2
Littlehey	SFU	3	4	3	2
Coldingley	FA	4	3	3	3
Swaleside	FFU	3	3	2	2
Kingston	FA	3	4	2	3
Dartmoor	SFU	3	3	3	3
Risley	FA	2	3	2	3
Blundeston	FA	3	3	3	2
Moorland	FA	3	2	3	3
Parc	FA	2	2	2	3
Featherstone	SFU	3	2	2	3
Women					
Cookham Wood	SFU	3	3	3	2
Morton Hall	SFU	3	3	3	3
Styal	FFU	2	2	1	3
Bullwood Hall	SFU	2	2	2	2
Send	FA	4	4	3	3
New Hall	SFU	3	3	3	2
Askham Grange	SFU	4	4	3	3
Bronze field	FA	3	3	4	2
Young adults					
Rochester	FA	3	4	2	3
Thorn Cross	FA	4	4	3	4
Feltham	FA	2	3	3	4
Swinfen Hall	FA	3	3	2	3
Northallerton	FA	3	2	2	3
Moorland	FA	3	2	3	3
Parc	FA	2	2	2	3
Aylesbury	FFU	4	3	2	2

Numeric:

1	Performing poorly
2	Not performing sufficiently well
3	Performing reasonably well
4	Performing well

Type of inspection:

FFU	Full follow up
SFU	Short follow up
FA	Full announced
FU	Full unannounced

Healthy establishment assessments (IRCs)

ESTABLISHMENT	TYPE OF INSPECTION	SAFETY	RESPECT	PURPOSEFUL ACTIVITY	PREPARATION FOR RELEASE
Oakington IRC	USFU	3	4	2	2
Dover IRC	USFU	3	3	2	2
Colnbrook IRC	FA	3	3	2	3
Lindholme IRC	FA	3	3	2	2
Yarl's Wood IRC	USFU	2	3	2	3

Numeric:

1	Performing poorly
2	Not performing sufficiently well
3	Performing reasonably well
4	Performing well

Type of inspection:

USFU	Unannounced short follow-up
FA	Full announced

Prisoner survey responses

		LOCALS	TRAINERS	OPEN	HIGH SECURITY	YOUNG ADULTS	WOMEN
	Numbers highlighted in pink show the best score across functional types						
	Numbers highlighted in blue show the worst score across functional types						
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts							
12a	How was the cleanliness of the escort van? (very good/good)	51	48	52	48	36	43
12b	How was your personal safety during the journey? (very good/good)	62	63	62	49	62	56
12c	How was the comfort of the van? (very good/good)	12	16	22	18	11	14
12d	How was the attention paid to your health needs? (very good/good)	28	33	34	23	35	31
12e	How was the frequency of comfort breaks? (very good/good)	10	13	16	9	12	12
13	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	3	13	6	26	5	10
14	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71	69	75	61	70	74
15a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another establishment?	79	86	93	62	84	79
15b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	15	14	27	9	24	13
15c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	85	89	94	77	86	83
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction							
17	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	73	50	39	56	56	77
18	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with these problems within the first 24 hours?	31	17	12	19	17	39
19a	Were you seen by a member of healthcare staff in reception?	87	80	75	68	88	95
19b	When you were searched, was this carried out in a sensitive and understanding way?	63	73	74	63	70	80
20	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	56	72	76	59	66	72
21a	Did you receive a reception pack on your day of arrival?	74	69	73	38	82	80
21b	Did you receive information about what was going to happen here on your day of arrival?	44	44	66	30	58	45
21c	Did you receive information about support for feeling depressed or suicidal on your day of arrival?	46	42	51	28	54	49
21d	Did you have the opportunity to have a shower on your day of arrival?	30	46	68	38	36	49

Prisoner survey responses (continued)

Numbers highlighted in pink show the best score across functional types		LOCALS	TRAINERS	OPEN	HIGH SECURITY	YOUNG ADULTS	WOMEN
Numbers highlighted in blue show the worst score across functional types							
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction (continued)							
21e	Did you get the opportunity to have a free telephone call on your day of arrival?	62	41	41	28	72	63
21f	Did you get information about routine requests on your day of arrival?	32	35	50	25	45	34
21g	Did you get something to eat on your day of arrival?	81	77	75	60	81	80
21h	Did you get information about visits on your day of arrival?	45	42	64	23	56	41
22a	Did you have access to the chaplain/priest within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	43	48	59	35	54	53
22b	Did you have access to someone from healthcare within the first 24 hours?	70	69	78	67	69	81
22c	Did you have access to a Listener/Samaritans within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	36	32	47	24	27	39
22d	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	24	27	26	23	18	15
23	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	73	85	86	64	79	81
24	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	61	56	85	45	74	70
25	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	47	56	61	44	64	53
27a	Can you get access to legal reference books?	40	58	59	74	33	43
27b	Can you get access to communication with your solicitor or legal representative?	65	74	65	58	61	67
27c	Can you get access to information about leave to appeal?	41	50	48	56	41	39
27d	Can you get access to legal visits?	67	71	60	83	65	73
27e	Can you get access to help with legal costs?	45	46	42	53	37	45
27f	Can you get access to bail information?	40	33	35	32	35	48
28a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	50	67	79	82	60	64
28b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	78	98	98	97	74	93
28c	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	85	90	91	85	83	91
28d	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	66	78	65	74	63	65
28e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	32	45	30	55	47	43
28f	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	66	72	77	69	63	64

Prisoner survey responses (continued)

		LOCALS	TRAINERS	OPEN	HIGH SECURITY	YOUNG ADULTS	WOMEN
	Numbers highlighted in pink show the best score across functional types						
	Numbers highlighted in blue show the worst score across functional types						
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody							
28g	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	28	32	49	27	38	29
29	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	43	38	24	53	35	47
30	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	25	37	48	18	34	38
31	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	45	46	41	43	50	38
32a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	81	88	83	86	79	80
33b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	87	91	94	91	83	86
33a	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	39	52	62	51	51	43
33b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	16	22	20	22	19	27
33c	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly?	41	48	55	52	48	34
33d	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly?	17	23	20	27	19	22
33e	Are you given information about how to make an appeal?	29	36	39	43	31	38
34	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	10	15	7	28	13	12
35	Do you know how to apply to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman?	41	51	54	65	29	35
36	Is it easy/very easy to contact the Independent Monitoring Board (BOV)?	36	49	53	42	24	38
37	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	24	62	70	53	32	36
38	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	51	57	69	47	50	53
39a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C & R)?	5	4	1	4	10	4
39b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	12	12	1	14	16	10
40a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	52	58	52	52	50	64
40b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	58	63	56	64	57	65
41	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	64	63	74	65	54	80
42a	Do you have a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	68	75	67	72	73	77
42b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	69	79	74	76	69	76

Prisoner survey responses (continued)

		LOCALS	TRAINERS	OPEN	HIGH SECURITY	YOUNG ADULTS	WOMEN
	Numbers highlighted in pink show the best score across functional types						
	Numbers highlighted in blue show the worst score across functional types						
SECTION 5: Safety							
44	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	34	30	13	50	32	38
46	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	18	22	7	28	23	25
47a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By prisoners)	10	14	4	17	13	25
47b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By prisoners)	6	6	0	12	11	5
47c	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By prisoners)	1	1	0	4	1	1
47d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3	4	0	4	4	6
47e	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3	1	0	1	2	3
47f	Have you ever had your canteen/property taken since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3	3	0	5	4	6
47g	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By prisoners)	3	4	2	4	7	6
47h	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (By prisoners)	4	4	2	7	7	4
48	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	25	21	15	35	22	17
49a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By staff)	14	13	10	25	14	10
49b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By staff)	4	2	1	10	5	1
49c	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By staff)	1	1	0	2	1	1
49d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	5	5	5	7	4	3
49e	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By staff)	3	2	1	1	2	1
49f	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By staff)	6	3	4	9	6	3
49g	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (By staff)	3	4	5	9	5	2
50	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	10	12	5	21	11	17

Prisoner survey responses (continued)

Numbers highlighted in pink show the best score across functional types		LOCALS	TRAINERS	OPEN	HIGH SECURITY	YOUNG ADULTS	WOMEN
SECTION 6: Healthcare							
54	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	35	43	69	41	46	30
55a	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the doctor is good/very good?	41	42	63	48	41	37
55b	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the nurse is good/very good?	53	59	76	69	55	48
55c	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dentist is good/very good?	21	39	33	38	23	23
55d	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the optician is good/very good?	17	31	28	49	11	17
55e	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dispensing staff/pharmacist is good/very good?	41	49	58	56	30	41
56	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	28	27	41	21	20	23
57a	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison?	18	6	1	4	13	16
57b	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison?	13	4	2	4	15	10
SECTION 7: Purposeful activity							
59a	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	21	39	44	36	40	45
59b	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	24	47	51	37	40	42
59c	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	36	59	59	54	53	42
59d	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	19	47	46	38	35	31
59e	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	24	38	39	27	36	37
60	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	31	47	62	64	28	41
61	Can you get access to a newspaper every day?	36	59	83	60	38	31
62	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	39	50	58	49	57	36
63	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	48	38	66	33	55	40
64	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	9	13	59	7	10	29
65	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekend day? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	5	5	48	2	6	23

Prisoner survey responses (continued)

		LOCALS	TRAINERS	OPEN	HIGH SECURITY	YOUNG ADULTS	WOMEN
	Numbers highlighted in pink show the best score across functional types						
	Numbers highlighted in blue show the worst score across functional types						
SECTION 7: Purposeful activity (continued)							
66	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	56	80	74	81	57	56
67	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	17	22	25	24	25	23
SECTION 8: Resettlement							
69	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	18	34	36	35	30	36
70	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	26	52	50	53	47	53
71	Do you have a custody/sentence plan?	27	69	75	74	50	32
72	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your sentence plan?	18	45	60	36	37	22
73	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	45	33	22	45	35	32
74	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	35	18	12	23	28	24
75	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	42	28	55	16	43	41
76	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	68	70	91	66	73	77
77a	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding a job on release?	45	43	77	22	50	56
77b	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding accommodation on release?	47	46	74	24	54	67
77c	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with your finances in preparation for release?	36	32	57	21	35	47
77d	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with claiming benefits on release?	48	41	66	25	44	60
77e	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	35	34	63	18	42	52
77f	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with external drugs courses etc	47	41	64	21	46	58
77g	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with continuity of healthcare on release?	37	39	60	28	40	52
78	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	30	65	81	57	54	47

Survey responses by ethnicity

(across all functional types)

		WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	MIXED RACE
Numbers highlighted in pink show the best score					
Numbers highlighted in blue show the worst score					
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
14	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	72	64	65	67
15c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	88	81	87	83
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
20	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	66	63	52	56
23	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	81	69	66	81
24	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	62	67	65	64
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
27b	Can you get access to communication with your solicitor or legal representative?	69	70	72	63
28b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	87	85	85	86
28e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	40	40	44	41
30	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	33	27	26	27
31	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	49	33	28	34
33b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	20	17	16	15
37	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	43	38	37	40
38	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	57	43	42	50
39a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C & R)?	5	6	5	5
39b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	11	17	14	13
42b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	76	66	65	65
SECTION 5: Safety					
44	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	30	40	41	33
46	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	20	21	18	21
47d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	2	5	10	7

Survey responses by ethnicity (across all functional types) (continued)

<p>Numbers highlighted in pink show the best score</p> <p>Numbers highlighted in blue show the worst score</p>		WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	MIXED RACE
SECTION 5: Safety (continued)					
48	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	21	30	28	27
49d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	2	14	17	12
SECTION 6: Healthcare					
52	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	43	45	39	37
SECTION 7: Purposeful activity					
57a	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	34	36	33	39
57b	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	36	44	40	39
57c	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	45	56	54	45
57d	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	29	37	36	32
57e	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	30	34	38	35
58	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	39	40	39	32
60	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	46	57	53	62
61	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	46	44	43	49
62	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	14	11	13	14
63	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekend day? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	10	8	8	6
64	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	60	56	54	53
SECTION 8: Resettlement					
67	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	33	25	30	32
68	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	41	39	46	37
72	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	26	24	32	21
74	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	72	66	61	70
76	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	46	39	37	43

Detainee survey responses

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

		LINDHOLME	HASLAR	OAKINGTON	COLNBROOK	OVERALL COMPARATOR
	Numbers highlighted in pink show the best score across IRCs					
	Numbers highlighted in blue show the worst score across IRCs					
SECTION 1: Transfers and escorts						
9	Did you spend more than four hours in the escort van to get to this centre?	25	18	22	36	27
10	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	55	28	77	43	53
11	Did you know where you were going when you left the police station or when transferred from another centre?	50	26	44	31	37
12	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	25	15	38	24	27
SECTION 2: Reception, first night and induction						
13	Were you told why you were being detained in a language that you could understand?	70	48	73	54	62
14	Were you given any written reasons why you were being detained in a language that you could understand?	52	43	69	42	52
15	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	70	82	64	88	77
16	Did you receive any help/support with these problems?	28	39	40	28	34
17	Were you seen by a member of healthcare staff on reception?	90	75	62	81	76
18	When you were searched in reception was this carried out in a sensitive and understanding way?	84	53	85	62	71
19	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	69	34	86	51	61
20	Did you receive a reception pack on your day of arrival?	31	34	62	35	43
21	Did you receive information about what was going to happen to you on your day of arrival?	31	23	52	14	30
22	Did you receive information about what support was available to people feeling depressed or suicidal on your day of arrival?	31	20	36	20	27
23	Did you get the opportunity to make a free telephone call on your day of arrival?	66	66	70	61	65
24	Did you receive information about how to make routine requests on your day of arrival?	34	36	25	28	29
25	Did you receive something to eat on your day of arrival?	58	54	54	61	57

Detainee survey responses (continued)

		LINDHOLME	HASLAR	OAKINGTON	COLNBROOK	OVERALL COMPARATOR
	Numbers highlighted in pink show the best score across IRCs					
	Numbers highlighted in blue show the worst score across IRCs					
SECTION 2: Reception, first night and induction (continued)						
26	Did you receive information about visits on your day of arrival?	26	38	49	30	37
27	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	63	39	42	30	36
28	Did you have access to a chaplain, priest, iman within your first 24 hours of arrival?	31	38	81	37	55
SECTION 3: Legal rights and respectful custody						
29	Can you get access to legal reference books?	47	41	57	39	46
30	Can you get access to information about appeal?	42	40	62	33	44
31	Can you get access to help with legal costs?	21	25	62	27	36
32	Can you get access to bail information?	40	40	56	41	45
33	Can you get access to your official papers to help your case?	16	10	47	15	23
34	Can you get access to official information reports on your country?	14	9	22	21	18
35	Do you have a solicitor or legal representative?	59	53	86	66	69
36	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal rep. when you were not present?	3	11	7	14	10
37	Is it easy/very easy to see an immigration officer when you want?	43	32	27	11	24
38	Have you had any monthly reviews of your case?	29	37	10	31	25
39	Did you receive the results in writing?	23	46	9	47	29
40	Were the results explained to you?	11	29	9	25	17
41	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	82	73	58	60	65
42	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to sleep in your room at night?	68	35	78	53	59
43	Can you normally get access to your stored property if you need to?	63	51	61	48	54
44	Is the food very good/good?	24	12	67	40	41
45	Does the shop sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	44	37	55	49	48
46	Do you feel that your religious beliefs are respected?	89	72	92	69	79
47	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your own faith if you want to?	53	48	86	58	64
48	Is it very easy/easy to get a complaint form?	66	35	48	36	43
49	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	18	13	28	15	19

Detainee survey responses (continued)

		LINDHOLME	HASLAR	OAKINGTON	COLNBROOK	OVERALL COMPARATOR
	Numbers highlighted in pink show the best score across IRCs					
	Numbers highlighted in blue show the worst score across IRCs					
SECTION 3: Legal rights and respectful custody (continued)						
50	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly?	15	13	31	12	18
51	Is it easy/very easy to contact the Independent Monitoring Board (BOV)?	17	7	16	14	14
52	Have any members of staff physically restrained you?	0	33	8	25	18
53	Have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	3	24	13	40	25
54	Do you have a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	66	58	80	55	65
55	Do most staff treat you with respect?	87	51	89	69	75
SECTION 4: Safety						
56	Have you ever felt unsafe in this centre?	35	74	32	59	50
57	Has another detainee or group of detainees victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	15	42	14	46	31
58	Has another detainee said anything insulting to you since you have been here?	7	4	7	16	9
59	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here by a detainee?	2	3	4	13	7
60	Have you experienced unwanted sexual attention here from another detainee?	2	0	4	8	4
61	Have you been verbally or physically abused because of your cultural or ethnic background since you have been here by detainees?	4	7	5	20	11
62	Have you been verbally or physically abused because of your nationality since you have been here by detainees?	4	1	5	18	9
63	Have you ever been made to hand something over by other detainees?	9	1	2	12	6
64	Have you been verbally or physically abused because you were new here by detainees?	7	3	7	15	9
65	Have you been verbally or physically abused because of drugs by detainees?	7	0	2	4	3
66	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	13	40	14	43	28
67	Has any member of staff said anything insulting to you since you have been here?	4	1	1	16	7
68	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here by any member of staff?	2	1	5	16	8

Detainee survey responses (continued)

		LINDHOLME	HASLAR	OAKINGTON	COLNBROOK	OVERALL COMPARATOR
	Numbers highlighted in pink show the best score across IRCs					
	Numbers highlighted in blue show the worst score across IRCs					
SECTION 4: Safety (continued)						
69	Have you experienced unwanted sexual attention here in the centre by staff?	2	1	5	7	4
70	Have you been verbally or physically abused because of your cultural or ethnic background since you have been here by a member of staff?	4	4	5	18	9
71	Have you been verbally or physically abused because of your nationality since you have been here by a member of staff?	2	3	5	19	9
72	Have you been verbally or physically abused because you were new here by staff?	4	3	3	12	6
73	Have you been verbally or physically abused because of drugs by staff?	4	1	3	4	3
74	If you have been victimised by detainees or staff, did you report it?	2	40	2	18	14
SECTION 5: Healthcare						
75	What do you think about the healthcare in this centre? (very good/good)	40	31	49	26	36
76	Do you have any health problems that have been caused by mistreatment?	24	40	14	42	30
77	Is an interpreter available if you need one during healthcare assessments?	12	15	44	13	23
78	Can you get access to prescription medication you were taking beforehand?	20	21	29	30	26
79	Can you get access to free condoms/contraception?	12	25	10	2	10
80	Can you get access to free sanitary products?	33	46	26	25	30
81	Can you get access to health information in your own language?	29	37	28	19	24
SECTION 6: Purposeful activity						
82	Are you involved in any education here?	42	54	31	35	38
83	Is the education helpful?	35	43	30	27	31
84	Would you like to work here?	50	22	39	63	47
85	Is there enough to do to fill your time here?	32	38	56	37	43
86	Can you go to the library at least once a week?	54	73	46	68	60
87	Can you go to the gym three or more times a week?	41	52	17	38	34

Detainee survey responses (continued)

		LINDHOLME	HASLAR	OAKINGTON	COLNBROOK	OVERALL COMPARATOR
	Numbers highlighted in pink show the best score across IRCs					
	Numbers highlighted in blue show the worst score across IRCs					
SECTION 7: Communication						
88	Is it easy/very easy to receive incoming calls?	39	32	43	47	42
89	Is it easy/very easy to make outgoing calls?	27	27	62	61	49
90	Is it easy/very easy to send letters?	38	40	18	48	36
91	Is it easy/very easy to receive letters?	39	47	24	49	39
92	Can you go to the library at least once a week?	75	56	24	78	57
93	Are you able to send a fax to your legal rep. free of charge?	38	35	20	53	37
94	Are you able to send letters to your legal rep. free of charge?	34	34	20	53	37
95	Have you had a visit since you have been in here from your family or friends?	31	28	30	22	27
96	Have you had a visit from your solicitor/legal representative?	14	23	67	36	44
97	Are you and your visitors treated well/very well by visits staff?	37	29	45	44	41

Expenditure

FOR APRIL 2005 – MARCH 2006	
Staff costs	2,608,351
Travel and subsistence	359,803
Printing and stationery	77,685
Information technology	52,015
Translators	13,073
Meetings and refreshments	10,403
Telecommunications	5,201
Recruitment	3,080
Conferences	2,035
Office equipment	1,601
Training and development	830
Total	3,134,077

Inspectorate staff

Anne Owers CBE Chief Inspector

Barbara Buchanan Senior PS to the Chief Inspector

Nigel Newcomen Deputy Chief Inspector

Michelle Reid PS to the Deputy Chief Inspector

A TEAM

Francis Masserick	Team Leader	John Simpson	Inspector
Ruth Whitehead	Inspector	Janine Harrison	Inspector
Gail Hunt	Inspector		

O TEAM (WOMEN)

Michael Loughlin	Team Leader	Paul Fenning	Inspector
Joss Crosbie	Inspector	Brett Robinson	Inspector
Gabrielle Lee	Inspector		

N TEAM (YOUNG ADULTS)

Roger Haley	Team Leader	Jonathan French	Inspector
Stephen Moffatt	Inspector	Gordon Riach	Inspector
Hubisi Nwenmely	Inspector		

I TEAM (IMMIGRATION DETENTION)

Jim Gomersall	Team Leader	Hindpal Singh Bhui	Inspector
Eileen Bye	Inspector		

J TEAM (JUVENILES)

Fay Deadman	Team Leader	Ian Macfadyen	Inspector
-------------	-------------	---------------	-----------

HEALTHCARE TEAM

Elizabeth Tysoe	Head of Healthcare	Sarah Corlett	Healthcare Inspector (p/t)
Mandy Whittingham	Healthcare Inspector	Sigrid Engelen	Substance Use Inspector (p/t)
Bridget McEvelly	Healthcare Inspector (p/t)	Keith McInnis	Substance Use Inspector (p/t)

Inspectorate staff (continued)

THEMATICS AND RESEARCH			
Monica Lloyd	Head of Thematics	Rachel Worsley	Researcher
Louise Falshaw	Head of Research and Development	Laura Nettleingham	Researcher
		Samantha Booth	Researcher
Julia Fossi	Senior Researcher	Deborah Tye	Research Trainee
		Amy Summerfield	Research Trainee

ADMINISTRATION TEAM			
Angela Johnson	Head of Administration	Gemma Kelly	Admin Officer
Lauren McAllister	Editor	Francette Montgry	Admin Officer
Stephen Seago	Admin Officer	Neil Goodson	Admin Officer

Freelance editors: Brenda Kirsch; Charles Peyton; Emily Wood.

Staff who left during the reporting period: Mark Challen; Denise Hotham; Fiona Kennedy; Claire Kumahor; Shantell Marquis; Lucy Trussler.

RUTH WHITEHEAD
<p>Ruth Whitehead had been a prisons inspector for nearly 10 years at the time of her untimely death in October 2006. She was an invaluable member of her inspection team, with an unerring ability to get behind statistics and factual evidence, and to analyse and present it in a readable and compelling form. One of her earliest tasks was to contribute to the Inspectorate's seminal thematic report on the treatment of young prisoners; and she completed the cycle, three years ago, by leading work on our equally important thematic review of older prisoners. Until just before her death, she was still editing and putting together Inspectorate reports.</p> <p>Ruth will be much missed by all her colleagues in the Inspectorate, and by all those who worked with her and were helped by her work. With her family, we are planning a memorial for her, directed towards helping young people in prison.</p>



Published by TSO (The Stationery Office) and available from:

Online

www.tsoshop.co.uk

Mail, Telephone, Fax & E-mail

TSO

PO Box 29, Norwich NR3 1GN

Telephone orders/General enquiries 0870 600 5522

Fax orders 0870 600 5533

Order through the Parliamentary Hotline *Lo-call* 0845 7 023474

Email bookorders@tso.co.uk

Textphone 0870 240 3701

TSO Shops

123 Kingsway, London WC2B 6PQ

020 7242 6393 Fax 020 7242 6394

16 Arthur Street, Belfast BT1 4GD

028 9023 8451 Fax 028 9023 5401

71 Lothian Road, Edinburgh EH3 9AZ

0870 606 5566 Fax 0870 606 5588

The Parliamentary Bookshop

12 Bridge Street, Parliament Square

London SW1A 2JX

Telephone orders/General enquiries 020 7219 3890

Fax orders 020 7219 3866

Email bookshop@parliament.uk

Internet bookshop.parliament.uk

TSO@Blackwell and other Accredited Agents

ISBN 978-0-10-294432-7



9 780102 944327