

Report on an unannounced full follow-up
inspection of

HMP The Mount

18–22 September 2006

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2007

ISBN 13: 978-1-84726-164-9

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
1 Healthy prison summary	9
2 Progress since the last report	
<hr/>	
1 Arrival in custody	19
2 Environment and relationships	23
3 Duty of care	27
4 Healthcare	39
5 Activities	43
6 Good order	51
7 Services	57
8 Resettlement	59
3 Summary of recommendations	67
Appendices	
<hr/>	
I Inspection team	i
II Prison population profile	ii
III Racist incident report forms	v
IV Time out of cell	ix
V Wing file analysis	xi
VI The use of force	xv
VII Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	xvii

Introduction

The Mount is a busy category C training prison with a chequered history. When we last visited in 2004, we called for decisive action from the Prison Service to remedy a failing prison that was unsafe, dirty, providing too little work and training, and failing to resettle its prisoners effectively. On our return, for an unannounced full follow-up inspection, we found a prison that had been transformed: the prison was safe, clean, purposeful and focused on resettlement. There was still more to do, but the change was remarkable.

The Mount, like all training prisons, manages large numbers of medium risk prisoners with relatively low staff-prisoner ratios. This demands that staff are properly and confidently in control, supported by robust policies and a strong management lead. Sadly, on our previous inspection we found this to be far from the case: bullying was rife, often associated with drugs, safety procedures were poor, management was weak and prisoners and staff felt unsafe. To its credit, the prison had risen to our criticisms: a new safer custody and violence reduction strategy had been implemented, suicide and self-harm prevention arrangements were much improved and bullying had been reduced - although more focused work was needed with bullies and victims. Security had also improved: the segregation unit was unrecognisable from the appalling facility visited in 2004 and major incursions had been made into the supply of drugs into the jail.

The improvement in the cleanliness and presentation of the prison, both inside and out, had been dramatic. Showers now had cubicles and most cells had curtains and lockable security boxes, although there were still some single cells which were doubled and had toilets screened only by a curtain, which was unacceptable. Health services had improved significantly.

One issue that remained to be addressed satisfactorily was the starkly more negative perception of the prison held by black and minority ethnic (BME), foreign national and Muslim prisoners. As BME prisoners now constituted around 70% and foreign nationals around 40% of the population, and Muslims constituted the largest active faith group, these negative perceptions needed to be addressed urgently. We identify a number of procedural frailties regarding the management of race issues and provision for foreign nationals, but the key issue is the need for managers, perhaps with help from organisations in the outside community, to assist their predominantly white staff to ensure and demonstrate the appropriateness and impartiality of their work with their BME, foreign national and Muslim prisoner populations.

The Mount was now a very purposeful prison with excellent education and a wide range of well managed work and training opportunities. It was also focused on its resettlement role, with a clear strategic vision, much improved sentence planning, a range of impressive offending behaviour and drug treatment courses and sound reintegration facilities. We were surprised how little use was made of release on temporary licence (ROTL) to assist with finding employment and other resettlement activities but, overall, The Mount was on the way to becoming a first rate training prison.

It is gratifying to return to a prison that we have previously felt compelled to criticise severely and find that, in a relatively short period of time, staff and managers have been able to transform it. Inevitably there are significant issues that remain to be addressed - particularly the negative perceptions of the majority BME population - but, overall, progress at The Mount has been very impressive.

Anne Owers
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

November 2006

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Category C adult male training prison.

Area organisation

Eastern

Number held

14.11.06: 720

Certified normal accommodation

704

Operational capacity

720

Last inspection

Full inspection: 11-15 October 2004.

Brief history

The Mount opened in 1987 as a young offender institution and changed role to a male category C prison in 1992.

Description of residential units

Lakes, Ellis, Fowler and Brister each has four wings with 28 cells on two landings.

Annexe accommodates 36 prisoners on two floors.

Howard (added 1995) and Dixon (added 1999) two-landing open gallery wings.

Section 1: Healthy prison summary

Introduction

HP1 The purpose of this inspection was to follow up the recommendations made in our last full inspection of 2004 and examine progress achieved. We have commented where we have found significant improvements and where we believe little or no progress has been made and work remained to be done. All inspection reports include a summary of an establishment's performance against the model of a healthy prison. The four criteria of a healthy prison are:

Safety	prisoners, even the most vulnerable, are held safely
Respect	prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity
Purposeful activity	prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them
Resettlement	prisoners are prepared for their release into the community and helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending

HP2 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the National Offender Management Service.

...performing well against this healthy prison test.

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

...performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test.

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

...not performing sufficiently well against this healthy prison test.

There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well being of prisoners. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.

...performing poorly against this healthy prison test.

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

HP3 The Inspectorate conducts unannounced follow-up inspections to assess progress against recommendations made in the previous full inspection. Follow-up inspections are proportionate to risk. In full follow-up inspections sufficient inspector time is allocated to enable an assessment of progress and also to allow in-depth analysis of areas of serious concern identified in the previous inspection, particularly on safety and respect, or matters of concern subsequently drawn to the attention of the Chief Inspector. Inspectors use the findings of prisoner surveys (where available), prisoner

focus groups, research analysis of prison data and observation. This enables a reassessment of previous healthy prison assessments held by the Inspectorate on all establishments, and published in reports from 2004 onwards.

Safety

- HP4 One of the three main recommendations on safety had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and one not achieved. There were another 27 recommendations, of which 21 had been achieved fully, five partially and one not achieved. Arising from our findings, we have made a further 18 recommendations.
- HP5 At the time of our last inspection the prison was described as performing poorly in safety with serious gaps, particularly in the areas of anti-bullying and suicide prevention, and a poorly managed segregation unit. There had been significant progress against our recommendations in the areas of safer custody, violence reduction, security intelligence management and drug supply reduction. The segregation unit now operated decently and had been renamed as the care and separation unit (CSU). Further work was needed in induction programming and first night arrangements.
- HP6 An average of 12 prisoners were received weekly and relationships between prison staff and the escort contractor (GSL) were described on both sides as good. The reception building was clean and bright, and staff worked with prisoners in a friendly and professional manner. Thought had been given to the needs of prisoners and there was a great deal of information available, including daily newspapers. Generally prisoners did not spend excessive time in reception.
- HP7 First night information was provided by prisoner Insiders, but not all new arrivals received a one-to-one interview with a member of staff.
- HP8 The comprehensive 36-page induction booklet was routinely issued to all prisoners, but was in English only and not accessible to those with poor literacy. There was a rolling induction programme, but prisoners could wait lengthy periods to start it.
- HP9 A comprehensive safer custody and violence reduction strategy ensured that all incidents of bullying were reviewed, as was all other information that might indicate bullying. There was a need to formalise interventions with bullies and to support victims. The introduction of the assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring system earlier in 2006 had addressed our previous concerns. There were now more Listeners and they spoke positively of their support from staff. There was evidence that Listeners could act proactively. At the time of the inspection only four prisoners were on open ACCT forms, and there had been no deaths in custody since the last inspection. The degree of coordination and integration between suicide prevention, anti-bullying and drug supply and demand reduction was among the best we have seen recently in similar establishments.
- HP10 The segregation unit had been retitled the CSU and was unrecognisable from the unit described in 2004. It was clean and there were underpinning systems to ensure prisoners were well cared for. The special cell was little used and, with one identified exception, use of force, was not excessive. Prisoners held in the CSU had access to education, PE and a good selection of library books.

- HP11 Security arrangements had been reviewed and restructured. The cell searching cycle was well managed and prisoners were made aware of rules relevant to them.
- HP12 The year-to-date positive rate of mandatory drug testing (MDT) was now only 6% and 39 prisoners were on the frequent testing programme. Despite the comprehensive drug supply reduction programmes, 31% of respondents to our survey, against the training prison comparator¹ of 26%, said it was easy to get hold of illegal drugs. This was, however, a significant reduction from the 44% response in 2004
- HP13 Overall, we considered that the prison had improved considerably and was now performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test.

Respect

- HP14 One main recommendation on respect had been achieved and the other had been partially achieved. There were another 42 recommendations, of which 27 had been achieved fully, nine partially and six not achieved. Arising from our findings, we have made a further 23 recommendations.
- HP15 At the last inspection the prison was assessed as performing poorly on respect and was described as dirty, with many core services not consistently delivered to prisoners.
- HP16 The establishment's grounds and living areas had been transformed. Living accommodation for prisoners had improved dramatically. Showers were now in cubicles, and all cells had curtains and secure boxes for prisoners' property. The grounds were clean, even at night and first thing in the morning. Some single cells still had to be used to accommodate two prisoners, with an in-cell toilet screened only by a curtain, and were unfit for purpose. Not all meals had to be taken in cell. There were better arrangements for the control and issue of prison clothing, but there were still very few items that could be sent in from home for prisoners or handed in at visits.
- HP17 Most staff-prisoner relationships appeared cordial but there was limited engagement on association and the personal officer scheme required further development.
- HP18 Although black and minority ethnic (BME) prisoners now made up some 70% of the population, we were concerned by the exceptionally negative views of the prison among this majority group of prisoners. These negative views were also shared among foreign national and Muslim prisoners. Our survey and the groups of BME prisoners we met expressed a wide range of negative perceptions: 44% of BME respondents said that they had felt unsafe in the prison, compared to only 21% of white respondents; and 31% of BME respondents, compared with 23% of white respondents, said they had been insulted or assaulted by staff.
- HP19 To its credit, the establishment was active in its approach to promoting positive race relations. There was a comprehensive action plan, the race equality action team now met monthly, and the race equality officer was now full-time. However, some investigations into complaints on racist incident report forms were superficial and

¹ The comparator figure is calculated by aggregating all survey responses together and so is not an average across establishments.

BME prisoners were particularly concerned about the failure to investigate prisoners' complaints against staff properly.

- HP20 Overall, it was disappointing that, although we had drawn attention in 2004 to the need to analyse and respond appropriately to negative prisoner perceptions, and despite a subsequent increase in BME prisoners, there had been no apparent success in altering prisoners' perceptions.
- HP21 Foreign national prisoners now comprised 40% of the population but facilities and arrangements to support them were not fully developed. There was a full-time liaison officer with some administrative support and a monthly visit from Immigration and Nationality Directorate (IND) staff, which had not increased with the growth in foreign national prisoners. There was little use of translation and interpretation services and little material available in any language other than English. There were foreign national representatives who met fortnightly. Our Survey indicated that foreign national prisoners felt that they were less well treated than their British counterparts.
- HP22 The multi-denominational chaplaincy team was well integrated into the prison. In our survey, prisoners said their faith needs were well served, although responses to our survey from Muslim prisoners, the majority faith group, were often significantly worse than for non-Muslim prisoners.
- HP23 All four recommendations on catering had been achieved, and levels of satisfaction reported in the survey were now similar to the training prison comparator.
- HP24 The incentives and earned privileges scheme had recently been reviewed and operated well. All our previous recommendations had been achieved. Only four prisoners were on the basic level at the time of the inspection. In our survey 71% said staff treated them with respect, against the comparator of 62%, and there was no evidence of inappropriate or disrespectful language used by staff to or about prisoners. There were regular staff entries on prisoner wing files, but these were not linked to their sentence plans. There were a large number of consultative groups.
- HP25 Health services had improved significantly, and prisoners had good and easy access to primary care clinics. Dental services were acknowledged to be poor but there were plans to introduce a community dental service. Mental health services were well developed. Only one of our previous recommendations in this area had not been met.
- HP26 Overall, we considered that the prison had improved but was still not performing sufficiently well against this healthy prison test.

Purposeful activity

- HP27 The only main recommendation on purposeful activity had been partially achieved. There were another 16 recommendations, of which four had been achieved fully, nine partially and three not achieved. Arising from our findings, we have made a further seven recommendations.
- HP28 At our last inspection we assessed the establishment as not performing sufficiently well in its provision of purposeful activity. By contrast most prisoners were now allocated to work or other occupational activity and very few were unemployed.

Education had improved and there were good links to sentence planning. Progress on accreditation of work needed further development.

- HP29 There was a formal weekly labour allocation board and good monitoring systems were in place. Only 37 prisoners were unemployed at the time of the inspection.
- HP30 The education department was well managed and prisoners enjoyed their learning. Education was attended by 295 prisoners, 87 of whom were full-time. There was good provision of English for speakers of other languages. Waiting lists for education were well managed. Individual learning plans were linked effectively to sentence plans. The spacious and well-furnished library was open for 11 sessions weekly and received 300 to 400 visits a week. The number of books that supported learning had increased, as had the stock of books for foreign national prisoners.
- HP31 There were ten workshops with 271 places that offered a range of work, as well as work in the gardens, waste management and a range of domestic jobs. However, there was insufficient opportunity for prisoners to gain qualifications in workshops. Only 40 prisoners worked towards vocational qualifications.
- HP32 The PE department had only recently reached full staffing and the number of accreditations had not increased significantly. More than half the population, 57%, used the gym regularly.
- HP33 Prisoners in full-time work had over ten hours out of cell a day. Association opportunities were predictable, and unpredicted cancellations were extremely rare.
- HP34 Overall, we considered that the prison had improved and was now performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test.

Resettlement

- HP35 All three main recommendations on resettlement had been achieved. There were another 24 recommendations, of which 20 had been achieved and four not achieved. Arising from our findings, we have made a further ten recommendations.
- HP36 At our last inspection we assessed the establishment as not performing sufficiently well on resettlement. By contrast resettlement policies now met the needs of prisoners and followed the recognised resettlement pathways. Sentence planning had dramatically improved and offending behaviour programmes operated well. Public protection arrangements were well organised and better coordinated. Some arrangements for life-sentenced prisoners were in arrears, and there was hardly any use of release on temporary licence (ROTL) to prepare prisoners for release.
- HP37 The resettlement strategy had been replaced by a strategic pathways document that incorporated the main resettlement pathways and provided a comprehensive tool for staff. There was good use of information from OASys (offender assessment system), and there had been a recent additional population profile by the psychology department. In our survey, 69% said they knew how to get help with accommodation and employment, against the comparators of 50% and 49%. There were, however, no resettlement services for foreign national prisoners.

- HP38 Sentence planning had improved significantly since the last inspection, and 68% of prisoners surveyed said they had a sentence plan. We found that 85% of prisoners had an up-to-date sentence plan. Prisoners contributed to these plans.
- HP39 Three of our recommendations about reintegration planning had been met. A good range of services was available, particularly through the Foundation Training Company and the use of local RESET (resettlement prisoners offering advice and guidance) team staff.
- HP40 ROTL for resettlement purposes was hardly used, although over 207 prisoners had been released from the prison in the previous year.
- HP41 Offending behaviour programmes operated well. Waiting lists for the enhanced thinking skills (ETS) and controlling anger and learning to manage it (CALM) courses were well managed. Prisoners were prioritised for these on the basis of their OASys assessment of risk and identification as priority offenders. There was a comprehensive public protection plan that was all-embracing and provided a high degree of reassurance that prisoner risk was well addressed.
- HP42 Just 28 out of 363 prisoners considered for recategorisation to security category D had been approved in the previous six months. Reasons were given and included insufficient reduction of risk. Many foreign national prisoners were upset that they could not progress further, and blamed the prison rather than the national policies and instructions that restricted such progress.
- HP43 Most of the recommendations for visits arrangements had been achieved, although the telephone booking line was still very frustrating to use.
- HP44 There was a well-managed drug strategy. Over 250 prisoners were in active contact with the local counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service. There had been significant improvement in the voluntary drug testing arrangements. A Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt) programme that addressed substance misuse was well run and appreciated by participants.
- HP45 Overall, we now considered that the prison had improved and was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test.

Progress on main recommendations since the previous report

The paragraph reference numbers at the end of each recommendation below refer to its location in the previous inspection report.

Main recommendations

To the governor

- MR1 All newly received prisoners should experience comprehensive first night and induction procedures. (HP38)

Not achieved. Contrary to what was outlined in the first night policy dated April 2006, newly received prisoners did not get individual meetings with staff to discuss any concerns or anxieties before they were locked up for their first night. A group welcome meeting was held on the evening of arrival, which was led by prisoner Insiders, although residential staff and a governor were present. Prisoners were told at this meeting that they could meet staff if they had any concerns, but this was not a suitable alternative to a structured meeting with induction staff. PIN (personal identification number) telephone credit was issued to new arrivals in reception and was activated immediately. Prisoners who arrived on Mondays, when there was no evening association on Howard wing, the induction unit, could not use the telephone or shower before they were locked up for their first night. Induction started the following morning and consisted of four sessions. Although prisoners were told this could be completed in two working days, in practice this took seven days on average. New arrivals spent the remaining time locked up if they did not go to other regime activities, such as library or gym. The induction course covered all relevant elements, but prisoners were not always offered the opportunity to meet staff from different departments. Many sections were delivered solely by prisoner representatives and key staff, such as the race equality officer or the foreign national coordinator.

We repeat the recommendation.

- MR2 There should be a comprehensive safer custody and violence reduction strategy, incorporating work in anti-bullying, suicide prevention and drug supply and demand reduction. There should be an action plan for key improvement milestones, which should be implemented and monitored by a safer custody committee chaired by a senior manager. (HP39)

Partially achieved. The establishment had developed a safer custody and violence reduction strategy, incorporating key issues. This was monitored by the safer custody committee, chaired by the head of residence. These meetings set action points, which were routinely followed up at subsequent meetings, although no formal action plan had been produced. The suicide prevention policy had been updated in January 2006 and there were effective links, in policy and practice, between suicide prevention, anti-bullying and drug supply and demand reduction. The degree of coordination and integration was among the best we have seen recently in similar establishments.

- MR3 All cells and accommodation areas should be cleaned thoroughly each day with staff making routine inspections to ensure that high standards of cleanliness are met. (HP40)

Achieved. All cells were checked routinely as part of the daily staff check of the fabric and security of the accommodation. These checks were recorded and any remedial action was taken. Prisoners were informed if their cells did not meet the required standard and received incentives and earned privileges (IEP) warnings where appropriate.

- MR4 **The senior management team, together with the race and diversity adviser, should draw up and implement an action plan that ensures that the staff are trained and supported to work with an ethnically diverse population, and to address the perceptions of differential treatment held by black and minority ethnic prisoners. (HP41)**

Partially achieved. There was a race equality action plan, which was monitored at the monthly race equality action team meetings. Although the national Prison Service diversity course had been withdrawn, the establishment had sourced alternative training sessions through the Prison Service race equality advisory group. Only 91 Prison Service staff had not attended some form of diversity or cultural awareness training. These training sessions involved the diversity officer, who had recently left the establishment, and visiting guests who challenged stereotypical views and promoted awareness of other cultures. Staff were also given information on race equality policy and legislation affecting prisons. However, throughout the inspection many black and minority ethnic (BME) prisoners complained of negative perceptions of staff and unfair treatment. These perceptions had not changed since our inspection of 2004, and our survey results for this inspection were similar to the findings in 2004. (See also paragraph 3.26 and recommendation 3.31.)

- MR5 **All prisoners should be engaged in meaningful and accredited activity or education on a daily basis. (HP42)**

Partially achieved. At the time of our inspection only 37 prisoners were unemployed. However, there were insufficient opportunities for prisoners to gain qualifications for their work in many of the workshops (see paragraph 5.11).

- MR6 **All prisoners should have high quality sentence plans that drive their sentences and prepare them for successful resettlement. (HP43)**

Achieved. At the last inspection just 38% of prisoners surveyed said they had a sentence plan. This had increased to 68%, which was similar to the training prison comparator. There had been a strong drive to increase the quality and timeliness of sentence planning, and there were good systems to ensure that new arrivals were assessed within eight to ten weeks. A senior manager had the specific task of assessment and reintegration of prisoners and was responsible for the whole sentence planning process, including liaison with outside agencies.

- MR7 **There should be a comprehensive range of resettlement services available to meet the needs of the population. (HP44)**

Achieved. Resettlement provision was well managed and accessible to prisoners. The RESET (resettlement prisoners offering advice and guidance) team, which had been established before our last inspection, had been expanded and resettlement services were now based in the Foundation Training Company (preparation for release) and as part of a resettlement advice centre. These services were accessible to prisoners and well used (see paragraph 8.2).

MR8 The resettlement steering group should meet regularly, should consist of representatives from all relevant departments and agencies and should be responsible for the development, reviewing and monitoring of an effective resettlement strategy. (HP.45)

Achieved. The resettlement policy group normally met every two months. Meetings were well attended and multidisciplinary and had contributed to the development of the establishment's strategic pathway document, which had now replaced the resettlement strategy. Meetings were chaired by the head of offender management and included outside agencies and also prisoner representatives.

Progress on recommendations since the last report

Section 1: Arrival in custody

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners travel in safe, decent conditions to and from court and between prisons. During movement the individual needs of prisoners are recognised and given proper attention.

- 1.1 Regular dialogue should take place at an appropriate level between prison and escort staff to allow issues of concern to be raised and best practice developed. (1.5)

Partially achieved. Staff from the escort contractor, Global Solutions Limited (GSL), had attended the prison's security meeting in June and August 2006 to tackle the problem of prisoners produced late at courts. However, such meetings were not yet regular. We repeat the recommendation.

- 1.2 Reception opening times should be reviewed to ensure that staff are used in the most effective and efficient way and that all prisoners are dealt with promptly and properly. (1.6)

Partially achieved. Reception was open from 7.30am to 4.45pm on weekdays. It was not open in the evenings, weekends or during the lunch period. The prison received on average only 12-13 new prisoners each week, who generally arrived while the reception was open. However, reception staff were flexible and worked through their lunch period if an escort was due to arrive then. Indeed, during our inspection, staff kept the reception open over the lunch period to assist GSL with a prisoner transferring in. Although prisoners were not generally held in reception for lengthy periods, during our inspection we noted that one prisoner who had arrived at 12.10 pm was not located on to the induction unit until 5.30pm.

Additional information

- 1.3 Reception and escorting staff described a good and mutually helpful relationship. Reception staff offered a comfort break to prisoners remaining on the cellular vehicle before they continued with their onward journey.

- 1.4 The reception area was clean and tidy and reasonably welcoming. There were three holding rooms for newly received prisoners. The main room displayed good information and the front and back pages of two national newspapers were displayed each day in lockable cabinets. Staff were friendly to new receptions and treated them courteously. However, the strip searching area was not sufficiently private. It was in the main reception area, screened only by a waist-high partition.

Further recommendation

- 1.5 Prisoners should be held in reception for as short a time as possible.
- 1.6 The strip searching area in reception should offer complete privacy.

First days in custody

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners feel safe on their reception into prison and for the first few days. Their individual needs, both during and after custody, are identified and plans developed to provide help. During a prisoner's induction into the prison he/she is made aware of prison routines, how to access available services and how to cope with imprisonment.

- 1.7 The 'first days in custody' strategy should be implemented to ensure that all prisoners feel safe on arrival at The Mount. (1.24)

Partially achieved. See also paragraph MR1 and repeat recommendation. In our survey 84% of respondents said they felt safe on their first night, which was slightly below the comparator of 86% for training prisoners. Although much of the first night policy was in place, the central element of a one-to-one meeting with staff on a prisoner's first night did not happen.

Further recommendation

- 1.8 All newly arrived prisoners should have the opportunity to meet staff from their residential unit to discuss any fears or concerns. This should be done in private and in a relaxed environment.

- 1.9 Prisoners' property should be stored securely. (1.25)

Achieved. The stored property room was orderly and tidy and secured by a locked gate, for which there were only four keys in circulation. These keys had to be signed out from the gate each morning and were issued to reception staff on duty that day. Although property boxes stored in this room were not sealed, all items within them were sealed appropriately in Prison Service bags.

- 1.10 The contribution of prisoner orderlies to reception and first night procedures should be reviewed, drawing on good practice in other training prisons. (1.26)

Achieved. There were four prisoner Insiders, all of whom were resident on Howard wing, the induction unit. These Insiders attended reception when new prisoners arrived and were clearly identifiable by their bright orange embroidered t-shirts. The Insiders had compacts that outlined their role and responsibilities, and there was a local operating practice document. New arrivals were invited to an Insider-led welcome meeting on the evening they arrived, where they were given key information about the regime at The Mount.

- 1.11 Prisoners should be able to complete the induction and general preparation for work programmes within the prescribed time period and prisoners should be fully engaged throughout. (1.27)

Not achieved. See also paragraph MR1. The general preparation for work course was no longer offered as part of the induction process. The four-session induction programme covered manual handling, education and resettlement interviews, health and safety awareness and a core induction session. Although the programme offered only two full days of activity, in practice it was spread over a much longer period – on average seven working days, with up to 13 working days for some prisoners. Prisoners were not always fully occupied in the sessions – we saw prisoners reading newspapers. Some prisoners said they spent considerable time unoccupied before and after brief interviews or presentations. Although prisoners on induction could also go to other activities such as library or gym, if they were not engaged in these they were locked in their cells.

Additional information

- 1.12 The manager of the induction unit had recently contacted St Giles Trust in order to arrange for prisoner Insiders and other prisoner representatives to be offered the opportunity to achieve national vocational qualification level three in advice and guidance.
- 1.13 There was a comprehensive induction booklet, but this was available in English only. It contained some good and useful information but it was unwieldy, at 36 typed pages, and was difficult to use. Some of its language was not easy, particularly for those with poor literacy or English – including many of the 40% of the population who were foreign national prisoners.

Further recommendations

- 1.14 Prisoners should be fully occupied during the induction period. Induction should be completed within the prescribed time, and on completion prisoners should be allocated to a work activity that keeps them fully occupied throughout the working day.
- 1.15 The induction booklet should be in plain English, appropriate to the literacy levels of the population.
- 1.16 The induction booklet should be available in a range of appropriate languages.

Section 2: Environment and relationships

Residential units

Expected outcome:

Prisoners live in a safe, clean and decent environment within which they are encouraged to take personal responsibility for themselves and their possessions.

2.1 Cells designed for single occupancy should not be used as doubles. (2.5)

Not achieved. The establishment still accommodated two prisoners in cells designed to hold one, some with unscreened toilets. Although the number of such cells was less than in 2004, these cells remained unfit for purpose.

We repeat the recommendation.

2.2 All accommodation areas should be redecorated. (2.6)

Achieved. The establishment had made efforts to ensure the accommodation environment was acceptable. All areas had been redecorated and a continuous painting programme ensured accommodation was maintained to a high standard.

2.3 Each wing should have the same level of recreational facilities. (2.7)

Not achieved. Prisoners complained about the standard, range and quality of recreational facilities. The condition of equipment varied between units. In some we saw pool tables ripped and propped up with locker doors. We were told that damaged equipment had gone unrepaired for months.

We repeat the recommendation.

2.4 Cleaning materials should be available for prisoners to use in their cells. This system should be widely publicised to all prisoners. (2.17)

Achieved. Prisoners had access to cleaning materials each day. The system was well known and staff checked cleanliness during fabric checks. We were impressed with the standard of cleanliness throughout the establishment.

2.5 All in-cell toilets should be effectively screened to ensure privacy. (2.18)

Partially achieved. Although the establishment had made efforts to provide curtain screens for those cells with double occupancy, prisoners complained that these did not allow an adequate level of privacy. Prisoners in the care and separation unit (CSU) had no privacy screens for their in-cell toilet, and were also expected to eat their meals in cells (see paragraph 6.14 and recommendation 6.18).

We repeat the recommendation.

2.6 The system of kit exchange should be reviewed to ensure that prisoners have enough clean prison clothing of the right size, quality and design to meet their individual needs. (2.19)

Achieved. The stores management had been reorganised and there was close attention to

the supply and laundry arrangements for prisoner clothing. We heard no complaints from prisoners about clothing and observed no prisoners dressed inappropriately.

2.7 The main store room should be tidy and ordered. (2.20)

Achieved. The store room was unrecognisable from the chaos at the previous inspection. The contents were organised neatly and systematically and it was possible to see the stocks held. There were routine arrangements to re-stock reception daily with items issued to newly received prisoners. There were also stocks in reception for prisoners who might be taken to hospital at short notice.

2.8 Returned items should be checked for cleanliness before issue. (2.21)

Achieved. Under the new stores controls, all clothes were scrutinised before issue.

2.9 Prisoners should be able to access property held in storage within one week of making an application. (2.22)

Partially achieved. Detailed records tracked the time taken to issue goods in stored property or bought through catalogues from reception to the prisoners concerned. In most months over 80% of items were issued within the seven day target. The establishment was keen to meet the target and examined the underlying systems to reduce delays.

2.10 Items ordered from catalogues should be distributed to prisoners promptly and certainly within five working days of receipt by the prison. (2.23)

Partially achieved. The same systems as above operated to monitor issues and ensure prompt access. Some items previously only available through catalogue orders could now be bought from the prison shop (see paragraph 7.10).

Additional information

2.11 The establishment had made the required improvements to prisoner accommodation. The introduction of shower cubicles, security boxes and curtains for all cells had shown a commitment to improve the environment for prisoners. We were also impressed that the grounds throughout the establishment were clean and well maintained, which was a substantial improvement since 2004.

2.12 Prisoners were now allowed daily access to telephones and showers. There was a laundry on all units and we received no complaints about access to these.

2.13 Throughout the inspection, prisoners complained to us about the local policy that no property could be handed in on visits or sent in through the post from family or friends. They said their only option for new clothes was to buy items through a list of approved catalogues, which were expensive. Managers told us this policy had been introduced as a security measure to prevent illicit items entering the prison. However, given the establishment's security categorisation, this policy seemed overly restrictive.

2.14 There were at least two prisoners with a physical disability at the time of our inspection. There was no approved protocol for the evacuation of such prisoners should the need arise. Staff felt that other prisoners would take care of them in the event of an emergency. This was clearly inappropriate.

Further recommendations

- 2.15 Prisoners should be able to have items on the prison's facility list sent in through the post and handed in on visits.
- 2.16 There should be a clear evacuation protocol for prisoners who are disabled. Staff should be fully aware of this protocol and prisoners should not be made responsible for the evacuation of disabled prisoners.

Good practice

- 2.17 *All cells had curtains as well as metal lockers for prisoners to secure their possessions, and there were individual cubicles in all shower areas.*

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are treated respectfully by all staff, throughout the duration of their custodial sentence, and are encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions. Healthy prisons should demonstrate a well-ordered environment in which the requirements of 'security', 'control' and 'justice' are balanced and in which all members of the prison community are safe and treated with fairness.

- 2.18 Staff should engage with prisoners, particularly during association and exercise time, and contribute to the quality of prisoners' free time. (2.27)

Not achieved. In our survey 21% of respondents said that staff normally spoke to them during association, which was similar to the training prison comparator of 22% but higher than the 13% finding in 2004. The poor design of some residential units and the level of staffing (one senior officer and four officers) continued to make it difficult for staff to be in all areas occupied by prisoners. However, we observed little positive staff engagement with prisoners when they were out of their cells or exercising in the grounds.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 2.19 In our survey 71% said that most staff treated them with respect, which was significantly better than the 62% for 2004 and the training prison comparator. The responses of white and Muslim prisoners were the most positive (79% and 78%), while only 65% of BME prisoners felt they were treated respectfully.
- 2.20 During our inspection we observed no inappropriate or negative exchanges between staff and prisoners. Prisoners' complaints about unacceptable behaviour or attitudes tended to refer to a few named officers, and there was evidence that managers had taken firm action to address improper staff conduct. Staff used 'Mr' or the prisoner's first name extensively, both verbally and in writing, and used 'please' and 'thank you' when they talked to prisoners. As in 2004, staff were helpful and responsive once approached by prisoners for help or advice.

- 2.21 Our survey results relating to the personal officer scheme were significantly better than in 2004: 34%, compared to 18%, said they had met their personal officer in the first week, and 42%, compared to 31%, rated their personal officer as helpful or very helpful. However, we found little evidence of the personal officer scheme in operation.
- 2.22 Under the personal officer policy, updated in July 2005, each officer was allocated up to nine prisoners on the basis of cell location. Personal officers were expected to maintain regular contact with their prisoners, make meaningful entries in the prisoner's history sheet at least once a fortnight, and record any change in circumstances. Our random sample of 28 prisoner files (see appendix V) showed that the average number of entries was five a month, and the average gap between entries was 3.4 days. Unlike many other prisons, the number of negative entries about prisoners was very low – only five out of 589. However, the overwhelming majority of entries were 'neutral' and did not meet the criteria of being 'meaningful.' It was almost impossible to tell which, if any, of the entries had been made by the prisoner's personal officer. Several staff said they had limited opportunity to complete personal officer work.

Further recommendation

- 2.23 Management should ensure that personal officers perform their role satisfactorily, and that contact with prisoners is reflected in a chronological diary of meaningful contact in wing history sheets.
-

Section 3: Duty of care

Bullying

Expected outcome:

Everyone feels safe from bullying and victimisation (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault). Active and fair systems to prevent and respond to bullying behaviour are known to staff, prisoners and visitors, and inform all aspects of the regime.

- 3.1 The anti-bullying policy should be updated or replaced with the violence reduction strategy as soon as possible and given a high profile. It should be re-launched, supported by staff training. (3.6)

Achieved. A violence reduction policy had been produced and given a high profile in the establishment. The launch had included some training for staff, which had raised awareness of the policy.

- 3.2 A central register of potential bullies and victims should be held. (3.7)

Partially achieved. A central register was held in the communications room, although the figures recorded there did not match those of the safer custody senior officer. The management of this central record needed to be more robust and checked daily by the safer custody manager or an identified member of staff in her absence.

- 3.3 Instances of bullying should be reviewed monthly to inform the development of the new policy. (3.8)

Achieved. Bullying data was reviewed monthly and contributed to the development of the policy. The extent of monitoring was impressive. Bullying incidents were monitored by race, location and frequency.

- 3.4 A multidisciplinary anti-bullying committee should meet monthly to ensure that relevant issues are addressed and the strategy developed. (3.9)

Achieved. A monthly safer custody meeting had been established, and the agenda covered all relevant issues. There was impressive attendance from external agencies but little representation from prisoners.

- 3.5 Effective links should be established with the security department to ensure that all incidents of potential bullying are fully investigated and managed appropriately. (3.10)

Achieved. Security department staff attended all safer custody meetings. Security information reports that included bullying were referred to the safer custody senior officer. She investigated these and fed back the findings to the security department.

- 3.6 Prisoners' records should be completed fully, detailing what action has been taken. (3.11)

Achieved. Prisoners' wing records were completed detailing the action taken. In addition,

documents were opened on the bully (perpetrator intervention plan) and victim (victim support plan) to enhance monitoring.

Additional information

- 3.7 The safer custody senior officer was enthusiastic but needed greater control in the daily management of prisoners subject to monitoring, including involvement in the closure of each bullying document. Senior officers on each unit decided when an identified bully should be removed from the monitoring, but this was not consistent throughout the establishment. Prisoners were unclear as to when and why they would be removed from the additional monitoring.
- 3.8 The establishment had no recognised interventions to challenge the bully or support the victim in modifying their behaviour.

Further recommendations

- 3.9 The central register of bullies in the control room should be verified daily by the safer custody manager or a nominated member of staff in their absence.
- 3.10 Arrangements should be put in place to support and encourage greater prisoner representation at the safer custody meetings.
- 3.11 There should be a consistent approach to how wing managers manage bullying documentation, and the safer custody senior officer should be consulted before any bullying document is closed.
- 3.12 There should be interventions for bullies and victims, based on best practice in other prisons.

Self-harm and suicide

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide are identified at an early stage, and a care and support plan is drawn up, implemented and monitored. Prisoners who have been identified as vulnerable should be encouraged to participate in all purposeful activity. All staff are aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, are appropriately trained and have access to proper equipment and support.

- 3.13 **Monthly and quarterly analyses of self-harm incidents should provide indicators of trends to inform future operational and policy strategies. (3.18)**

Achieved. The safer custody officer's monthly report contained a wide range of data and intelligence, including a breakdown of the number of prisoners subject to self-harm monitoring by wing and ethnicity and a summary of prisoners 'of concern'. There had been a recent increase in the number of foreign national prisoners who attempted to self-harm or commit suicide, and two of the four open cases at the time of the inspection involved foreign nationals. Although the foreign national coordinator attended the case reviews of individual prisoners, she had not, so far, attended the safer custody committee. Managers responded promptly and positively to our suggestion that she should do so to enable a more strategic and coordinated approach to managing the risk of suicide and self-harm among this prisoner group.

3.14 All night staff should receive training in suicide prevention. (3.19)

Achieved. The new assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) system of managing prisoners at risk of self-harm had been introduced in January 2006. Of the total of 113 officers, 73 had received the required training and the safer custody officer had made special arrangements to train night duty staff during their working shift. During our night visit we found that staff were knowledgeable about suicide prevention procedures and aware of those prisoners on open ACCT forms or potentially vulnerable.

3.15 Self-harm response kits should be clearly accessible and their contents should be in good condition. (3.20)

Achieved. The safer custody officer was now responsible for ensuring self-harm response kits were properly equipped. All staff we spoke to could locate the kits. Anti-ligature knives had been issued to all staff since the last inspection.

3.16 More Listeners should be recruited; a Listener should be resident on the induction wing and one should be available in reception. (3.21)

Achieved. Since the last inspection, when there had been only three Listeners in post, the number had increased, peaking at 25 in 2005. Of the 13 Listeners in post during our inspection, some had been trained at The Mount while others had transferred in and were allowed to function as Listeners following satisfactory confirmation of their suitability from their previous prison. Listeners were based on the induction unit, where there was also a dedicated Listener suite. This was sparsely furnished, had a dirty, unscreened toilet, and did not provide a comfortable or relaxing environment. An Insider was available in reception and referrals were made to Listeners if appropriate. In our survey 50% of respondents said they had received information about support for feeling depressed or suicidal on their day of arrival, which was significantly better than the training prison comparator of 42%.

3.17 Prisoners should have direct access to Listeners upon request at night. (3.22)

Achieved. Requests to see a Listener during the night were subject to a formal risk assessment. When a Listener contact was considered unsuitable, the prisoner was offered use of the Samaritans telephone instead. Night staff were clear about the procedures for facilitating Listener access. The safer custody officer and Listeners confirmed that access during the night was rarely denied. In our survey 61% of respondents said they were able to speak to a Listener at any time if they wished, which was significantly better than the 42% response in 2004.

3.18 Care plans in F2052SH booklets should be regularly revised to record changing strategies in the care of prisoners. (3.23)

Achieved. The introduction of the ACCT system had rectified the main deficiencies in the management of prisoners subject to self-harm monitoring. The safer custody officer and senior managers now monitored care plans. Those we read clearly identified any progress made with an individual.

3.19 Prisoners should have prompt access to Listeners at night. (3.24)

Achieved. See paragraph 3.17.

Additional information

- 3.20 There had been no self-inflicted death of a prisoner at The Mount since the last inspection, and indeed for many years before that. The safer custody officer was a full-time senior officer. The current officer had been in post for just over a year and showed a strong commitment and imaginative approach to the work. She worked particularly closely with the mental health in-reach team and could offer very practical support to prisoners. For example, she ensured they had access to appropriate regime activities, encouraged them to keep diaries and ran relaxation classes.
- 3.21 The group of Listeners was representative of the population mix at The Mount. They told us they felt well supported by the safer custody officer and the Samaritans representative, and also commended the visible support and respect shown by staff and senior managers. Listeners believed that when they raised issues at the safer custody committee these were listened to, taken seriously and wherever possible, prompt action was taken. Under a passport system, Listeners carried identification and documentation that allowed them unrestricted access to all residential units. This meant they had been able to take a more informal yet proactive approach, and were available to speak to prisoners at all times and not just in response to immediate crises. They felt this had helped defuse many issues and anxieties for prisoners and reduced the need for more structured interventions.

Further recommendation

- 3.22 The Listener suite should be maintained to a satisfactory standard, providing a relaxing environment for prisoners in distress.

Good practice

- 3.23 *Listeners had unrestricted access to all residential units, which allowed them to be available to prisoners at all times and not just in response to immediate crises.*

Race relations

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners experience equality of opportunity in all aspects of prison life, are treated equally and are safe. Diversity is embraced, valued, promoted and respected.

- 3.24 **Action points arising from the race relations management team should be dealt with as quickly as possible. (3.34)**

Achieved. The race relations management team, now the race equality action team (REAT), met monthly and was chaired by the governing governor. Action points were mainly dealt with by the following meeting or entered on the establishment's race equality action plan, which was also reviewed during these meetings. At the time of our inspection, only one action point had not been resolved within a reasonable period, due to difficulties in sourcing the item involved. However, at the last management meeting the governor had set staff a deadline to resolve this issue or finally inform prisoners that the item could not be obtained.

Additional information

- 3.25 The percentage of prisoners from BME backgrounds was now 61%, an increase of 7% since 2004. Most such prisoners with whom we spoke were extremely negative and critical about staff and procedures at The Mount, which they felt were unfair. They believed that their treatment was inequitable compared to their white counterparts. Many felt that staff were ignorant of their needs and lacked general cultural awareness, although 9.25% of staff in contact with prisoners had identified themselves as from an ethnic minority. A Prison Service race equality advisory group (REAG) representative had visited the prison in August 2005 and found similar negative perceptions.
- 3.26 In our survey, only 13% of BME respondents felt their complaints were dealt with fairly, compared to 28% of white respondents; 44% said they had felt unsafe in the prison, compared to only 21% of white respondents; and 31%, compared to 23% of white respondents, said they had been insulted or assaulted by staff. Of the 40 questions we compared, 26 responses from BME prisoners were worse – 18 statistically significantly worse – and only 14 responses were better – only seven significantly better. The negative perception of this, the majority group within the prisoner population had not moved on since our inspection in 2004.
- 3.27 Many prisoners also acknowledged the governor in charge's support for promoting positive race relations. Formal investigations into staff misconduct were taken seriously and the governor had demonstrated a willingness to dismiss staff found to have behaved inappropriately.
- 3.28 There was a comprehensive race equality action plan. Targets were allocated to named staff and dates for completion were monitored effectively by the REAT. REAT meetings had also increased from bi-monthly in 2004 to monthly. All 26 members of the REAT, including prisoner representatives, had been trained recently by a representative from REAG. There were 16 race equality prisoner representatives. The chair and vice-chair were full-time. These representatives met weekly and produced a report for the REAT, which the chair and vice-chair also attended. Photographs of the REAT were on display throughout the prison, and the chair and vice-chair wore badges to identify themselves to other prisoners. A full-time race equality officer was in post and was committed to the task.
- 3.29 There was SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound) monitoring of race. This did not support prisoners' perceptions of poor access to provision. For example, BME prisoners were over-represented in access to the gym and education. However, while SMART monitoring data provided managers with information on prisoner access to services, it did not convey how prisoners felt they were treated in different areas of the prison regime. As such, further qualitative research into prisoners' negative perceptions was required. The SMART monitoring data was available to the prisoner race equality representatives, but many prisoners not involved directly in the race equality structure were not aware of its existence.
- 3.30 There had been 111 racist incident report forms submitted between April and September 2006. The timeliness of investigation and responses to parties had improved since 2004. Nevertheless, prisoners still said they had little confidence in the system, particularly regarding complaints against staff.
- 3.31 We reviewed 30% of the forms submitted between April and August 2006 (106 - see appendix III). Of the 50% from staff, 73% had been dealt with appropriately, compared to only 56% of those submitted by prisoners. In only ten forms did it appear that the complainant had been interviewed, and in only seven cases were witnesses called for an interview during the

investigations. In one investigation where prisoners alleged a member of staff had made racist remarks, of the seven available prisoners involved, as witnesses and complainants, only two were interviewed before it was concluded that the member of staff: 'did not use a racially derogatory remark'. The only staff member interviewed was the officer against whom the complaint had been submitted.

- 3.32 The race equality officer had not received any formal investigation training. Many of the issues highlighted in our review of racist incident report forms may have been a recording issue, as this officer's commitment was unquestionable. He said he often saw prisoners informally and, as many did not wish to be involved in investigations, he did not formally interview them. However, this was not always recorded.

Further recommendations

- 3.33 The quality of investigations into racist incident complaints should be improved and training in investigation techniques and procedures provided to the race relations liaison officer.
- 3.34 Research should be conducted immediately into the reasons for the negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic prisoners (BME). A steering group, involving prisoners and external agencies, should be established. Results should be widely publicised to improve perceptions among this group and any necessary remedial action taken.
- 3.35 A simplified and shortened version of the results of the SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound) race analysis data should be publicised throughout the prison and accessible to all prisoners.
- 3.36 The race equality officer should attend investigations officer training as a matter of urgency.

Foreign national prisoners

Expected outcomes:

Foreign national prisoners should have the same access to all prison facilities as other prisoners. All prisons should be aware of the specific needs that foreign national prisoners have and implement a distinct strategy, which aims to represent their views and offer peer support.

- 3.37 The policy and range of services available to foreign national prisoners should be widely publicised throughout the prison. (3.40)

Partially achieved. The foreign national policy of August 2005 was in the process of being updated. The current policy was available in residential areas, although many staff were unaware of much of its content. As in 2004, many staff did not know that foreign national prisoners could have free telephone calls in lieu of visits or airmail letters. There was very little information available in any language other than English. Key documents, such as the induction booklet, were not available in translation (see recommendation 1.16).

- 3.38 All identified foreign national prisoners should receive their entitlement to monthly free telephone calls to their families in their home countries. (3.41)

Not achieved. Prisoners had to apply each month to receive their free telephone calls home in lieu of visits. This was overly bureaucratic and relied on the prisoner being aware of the facility,

which even many staff were not. In the month before our inspection, only 142 of the 299 foreign national prisoners held received these telephone calls.

3.39 There should be a weekly surgery for dealing with, or referring on, the needs and concerns of foreign national prisoners. (3.42)

Partially achieved. Nine foreign national prisoner representatives were in post and met the foreign nationals coordinator and the residential governors fortnightly (increased from monthly since June 2006). This meeting gave the representatives a chance to air the concerns of foreign national prisoners. Posters showing the representatives were displayed throughout the prison, and the representatives delivered a session on the induction programme.

Additional information

- 3.40 There were 299 foreign national prisoners at the time of our inspection, 42% of the prison's population.
- 3.41 There was a full-time foreign nationals coordinator who received 18 hours of administrative support, which was not enough to keep up with the work generated and the number of enquiries. She visited the residential areas regularly, although a rota to inform prisoners of when she was visiting each wing had not been produced for some time.
- 3.42 A monthly foreign national management committee had been set up in April 2006 to focus on the specific and distinct needs of these prisoners. This committee was established to ensure that there were appropriate policies and procedures to cater for the needs of foreign national prisoners.
- 3.43 The Immigration and Nationality Directorate (IND) visited the establishment monthly and saw a maximum of 40 prisoners. This provision had not increased since our inspection in 2004, although the prison held a third more foreign national prisoners. The Detention Advice Service (DAS) attended only quarterly, which was insufficient for the population. Other than this, there was little assistance for foreign national prisoners to deal with deportation issues.
- 3.44 A foreign national information day had been held in August 2006 and a second day was planned. Staff had invited embassies, high commissions and other relevant agencies of assistance to prisoners, but attendance from these groups was not regular. The prison's resettlement strategy did not explicitly refer to the distinct needs of this group, and the prison was not in contact with agencies that could help with the resettlement of foreign national prisoners abroad.
- 3.45 A foreign national questionnaire had been issued in 2005, although only 38 out of 200 questionnaires were returned. This survey asked prisoners about their main concerns. The top two were the cost of telephone calls and contact with the immigration services. A second survey was planned for October 2006 and had been translated into four languages. The establishment was trying to source a cheaper international telephone card for prisoners.
- 3.46 Many staff with whom we spoke were unaware of many of the issues for foreign national prisoners. A list of prisoners and staff who spoke different languages was available on the prison computer system, although very few staff were aware of this. The prison records indicated that it held three non-English speakers, although residential staff were unaware of who these prisoners were or where they were located. A translation service had only been used so far to translate signs in the reception area and the foreign national questionnaire; it

had not been used as an interpretation service. The telephone translation service had been used only twice since January 2006.

- 3.47 Many foreign national prisoners said they were angry that the current situation prohibited their transfer to open conditions. The establishment still reviewed all prisoners for category D status, which added to their frustration. In our survey, only 62% of foreign national respondents felt that staff treated them with respect, which compared unfavourably to 75% of British nationals, and only 28% of foreign national respondents felt their personal officer was helpful or very helpful, which was significantly below the 47% for British nationals.
- 3.48 At the time of our inspection six prisoners were held on immigration warrants awaiting deportation. One of these was almost four months past his release date.

Further recommendations

- 3.49 All staff should be aware of the basic entitlement for foreign national prisoners outlined in the foreign national policy.
- 3.50 All foreign national prisoners should automatically receive a free telephone call home if they do not receive visits, and should not be required to apply for this entitlement each month.
- 3.51 There should be additional resources to assist in the management of foreign national prisoners.
- 3.52 The Immigration and Nationality Directorate (IND) and Detention Advice Service (DAS) should be requested to attend the prison more frequently.
- 3.53 There should be greater use of professional translation and interpretation services, which should be more widely publicised to staff. Key documents should be translated into the most appropriate languages. Information on prisoners and staff who speak foreign languages should be available to all staff.
- 3.54 Clarification should be provided on category D status for foreign national prisoners to ensure transparency and reduce prisoner frustrations.
- 3.55 Prisoners awaiting deportation past the sentence expiry date should be transferred to immigration removal centres.
-

Family and friends

Expected outcome:

Prisoners are encouraged to maintain contact with family and friends through regular access to mail, telephones and visits.

- 3.56 **The visits booking line should be sufficiently staffed to reduce booking delays. (3.57)**

Not achieved. The visits booking line was always busy and it was difficult to get through to make a booking. On the day we tried the line it was constantly engaged. Staff who operated the line were polite and took time to book people in for visits and explain the process. When we observed, the line never stopped ringing. It was not possible for visitors to book their next visit while they were at the prison.

3.57 Prisoners should be allowed to use a toilet without having to terminate their visit. (3.58)

Achieved. Prisoners who needed to use the toilet during a visit could now do so and the visit was not terminated. The waiting area for prisoners now had a toilet area that they could also use on their way into visits.

3.58 Prisoners should be accounted for quickly following visits so that visitors do not suffer delays in being allowed to leave. (3.59)

Achieved. Prisoners were now moved out of visits quickly and visitors were not delayed in leaving the establishment.

3.59 Audibility in closed visits should be improved. (3.60)

Achieved. The closed visits booths had been screened and it was now possible to talk easily through the screening. We tested their audibility during visits and conversation was practicable.

Further recommendation

3.60 Visitors should be able to book future visits while they are at the prison.

Applications and complaints

Expected outcomes:

Effective application and complaint procedures are in place, are easy to access, easy to use and provide timely responses. Prisoners feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are aware of an appeal procedure.

3.61 Application forms should be readily available on wings. (3.65)

Achieved. There was a wide range of application forms on all residential wings and our survey indicated no problems in accessing the forms: 94% of respondents said it was easy to get an application form compared to 79% in 2004.

3.62 Wing managers should check the quality and timeliness of replies to applications. (3.66)

Partially achieved. All wings maintained an application log for staff to record applications that had received a reply, and wing managers checked this log routinely. However, there was no system to monitor the quality of replies to applications. In our survey 52% of respondents felt applications were dealt with promptly and 51% fairly, which was higher than in 2004 and significantly better than the training prison comparators of 31% and 35%.

3.63 The response time for internal complaints should be improved. (3.67)

Partially achieved. Complaints were handed directly to operational managers at the morning briefing meeting and the complaints clerk diligently chased all outstanding complaints to ensure deadlines were met. The completed complaints forms we sampled had been responded to within the required timescales, although many were an interim reply that said that further investigation was necessary. In most cases the outcome of any further enquiry was not

attached to the original complaint, so it was not possible to know if or when the prisoner had received a final reply.

Additional information

- 3.64 The central complaints log showed that prisoners submitted an average of 200 complaints a month. These were analysed by topic but there was no consistent pattern in the issues raised. Most of the completed forms we sampled addressed the complaint fully and had a polite and often helpful reply. There were some thoughtful approaches, such as the detailed pro forma response to the influx of complaints that followed a rise in shop prices. There was no separate process for managing complaints against staff. Confidential access documentation was stored in the main complaints archive. The complaints clerk sometimes submitted 'test' complaint forms to ensure that all forms reached her and without delay.
- 3.65 Prisoner satisfaction with the formal complaints procedure had fallen since our last inspection. In our survey only 21% of respondents said that complaints were dealt with fairly, compared to 47% in 2004, and 25% said they were handled promptly, compared to 45% in 2004. These responses were also significantly worse than the training prison comparators. The perceptions of BME and Muslim prisoners were particularly poor; only 13% and 10% of each group thought that complaints were dealt with fairly, compared with 28% of white respondents and 27% of non-Muslims.

Further recommendations

- 3.66 There should be a system to quality check the responses to prisoner applications.
- 3.67 All interim replies to complaints should be followed up by a full response. A copy of this should be attached to the original complaint for any monitoring or audit of the timeliness or quality of responses.
- 3.68 A central register of complaints against staff should be maintained and monitored for emerging patterns or trends.

Legal rights

Expected outcome:

Prisoners are told about their legal rights during induction, and can freely exercise these rights while in prison.

- 3.69 A pool of staff should receive current training in legal services. (3.72)

Not achieved. Only two staff had up-to-date legal services training. Prisoners complained at their wing meetings about access to these staff and the time it took to see them.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 3.70 The provision of legal services should be publicised and coordinated. (3.73)

Not achieved. Prisoners were unaware of who the legal services staff were. Notice boards lacked photographs of trained staff and prisoners did not have confidence in the service. The service was not well coordinated. The recording of applications was inaccurate and it was

unclear whether a prisoner had been seen or not. Legal services staff had no identified time to deal with issues. To their credit, they sometimes dealt with applications in their own time. We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 3.71 There had been 27 applications to use legal services since May 2006. Prisoners who had made such applications told us they were not happy with the service because of delays in processing their applications.

Further recommendations

- 3.72 Legal services staff should be given a minimum of five detailed hours a week, and staff should be identified to cover in their absence.
- 3.73 The application system should clearly record if a prisoner has been assisted with his legal matters.

Section 4: Healthcare

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners should be cared for by a health service that assesses and meets their needs for healthcare while in prison and which promotes continuity of health and social care on release. The standard of healthcare provided is equivalent to that which prisoners could expect to receive in the community.

- 4.1 The waiting area should be separated from the area where medicines are administered to patients. (4.57)

Achieved. There was now a separate area for prisoners to collect medications. This was a small part-glassed 'pod', which gave a high level of privacy and the opportunity for prisoners to speak to the pharmacist. The waiting room had been improved and was in a good decorative state, with a good range of health promotion and healthcare information for patients.

- 4.2 The numbers of prisoners waiting for medicines should be controlled and they should be adequately supervised to ensure confidentiality during treatment times. (4.58)

Achieved. Although the numbers of prisoners in the waiting room had not decreased, and the area was still very busy and at times congested, the presence of a discipline or healthcare officer ensured that prisoners remained well controlled and that a good level of patient confidentiality was maintained. Many prisoners went to the healthcare department for non-clinical reasons, such as to check appointment times or for other general enquiries. The number of clinics and medication times also increased the numbers of prisoners who went through the department.

- 4.3 The healthcare application system should be reviewed and application forms placed in a dedicated healthcare box rather than being posted through the internal mail system. (4.59)

Not achieved. The system for prisoners to access healthcare remained unchanged. Prisoners gave application forms to discipline officers who sent them to healthcare through the internal mail. These applications – which identified the prisoner and the service they required – went into unlocked post boxes, which were accessible to all prison staff. This system was unacceptable. We were told that a dedicated healthcare box had been tried but had been abused by prisoners, who wrote inappropriate comments or entered false names. The healthcare manager had developed a new system in which prisoners could use a free telephone number from the wings to make an appointment through a healthcare administrator. However, this system was not in use because there were insufficient staff to operate it. **We repeat the recommendation.**

- 4.4 The appointments system should be reviewed and revised to ensure that all prisoners requiring treatment are seen without undue delay. (4.60)

Achieved. The appointment system worked well, although there were some delays in appointments because of the mass movement system for prisoners. However, prisoners were seen quickly and without undue delay. Prisoners who requested appointments with the GP or nurse were generally seen at the next available appointment, usually the following day as the GP and nursing staff were in every day except Sunday (when the GP was on call). Many prisoners used the 11.30am medicine collection time as an opportunity to speak to the nurse as well as the pharmacist. The only waiting list was for the dentist.

4.5 A review of all cancelled outpatient appointments should be undertaken to identify and rectify reasons for the cancellation. (4.61)

Partially achieved. The number of prisoners allowed out for external NHS appointments was restricted to one in the morning and one in the afternoon. Between June and August 2006, only four appointments were cancelled due to staff shortages but a further 25 had to be rebooked because of the restriction of only two appointments a day. Despite this, the healthcare manager had always been successful in getting patients to appointments if they were urgent. Many prisoners were referred for external appointments and one of the main difficulties for the prison was the number of clinics held on the same day. However, health managers were looking at ways to reduce the numbers, such as bringing more health professionals into the prison.

4.6 Staff should ensure that original, standardised prison prescription charts are used and that they are used during drug delivery and administration. (4.62)

Achieved. Standard drug and administration charts were used for all medicine management. The in-house pharmacist was responsible for all medicine administration while on duty and only used the recognised charts. Medication times were at 8.30am, 11.30am and 4.30pm. Supervised medications were issued as prescribed and in-possession medicines were generally given out at 11.30am. All the charts we reviewed were well maintained and in line with legislation. The pharmacy service was well organised and managed, and the primary care trust (PCT) provided excellent support to the pharmacist. Pharmacy supplies were from an independent wholesaler or direct from the manufacturer, and the quality of service was very good.

4.7 Administered medicines should be entered on the patient's prescription sheet. (4.63)

Achieved. See above. The in-house pharmacist and the PCT medicines management lead carried out regular random checks of charts to ensure they were correctly completed. Any medicines administered from the special sick list were also recorded on the patient's personal chart. Any medicines prescribed by the out-of-hours doctor that were unavailable from stock were bought through a private prescription and recorded on the patient's prescription chart.

4.8 The healthcare manager should seek professional advice on the storage and administration of medicines. (4.64)

Achieved. The healthcare manager worked closely with the PCT medicines management lead, and the pharmacy had been set up under the guidance of the PCT lead. The pharmacy was tidy, well furnished and secure, with lockable cupboards for all medical supplies. A dedicated medicines refrigerator contained only medicines. It was checked regularly and temperature readings were recorded.

4.9 The special sick policy should be reviewed to ensure that appropriate medication is supplied promptly. (4.65)

Achieved. A special sick policy had been introduced in June 2005 and was due to be updated in June 2007. It gave clear guidelines for the management of prisoners who reported sick at any time of the day or night.

4.10 Mental health services should be provided to meet the needs of the population. (4.66)

Achieved. There had been significant progress since our last inspection and a mental health

in-reach team had been established by the Hertfordshire Partnership NHS Trust. The team was still relatively new and was not yet completely staffed. It included a community psychiatric nurse (CPN), who had recently been promoted to in-reach manager, a part-time administrator and a visiting psychiatrist. There were adverts out for the vacant CPN post, a clinical psychologist and a dual-diagnosis nurse to support prisoners with complex mental health and substance use problems. A visiting psychiatrist provided two sessions a week. She had a caseload of 21 patients who she saw regularly. The in-reach manager had his own caseload. There had been no transfers to secure units in the previous three years. The mental health in-reach team accepted referrals from across the prison and from prisoners themselves. Referrals were discussed at a weekly referral meeting, which included staff from the in-reach team, chaplaincy, CARATs and healthcare, with a joint decision on the prisoner's future management. The team had excellent relationships with the rest of the prison and provided ongoing mental health awareness training for prison staff.

- 4.11 The chaplaincy played a key role in the management of prisoners with mental health concerns. The coordinating chaplain managed eight counsellors to whom anyone could make a referral, including prisoners themselves. Prisoners could have up to 12 counselling sessions and more were available if the need was great. The service worked extremely well in tandem with the mental health in-reach team, and many prisoners said they had received good mental health support.

Additional information

- 4.12 The healthcare department had undergone considerable change since the last inspection. The Dacorum Primary Care Trust (PCT) was responsible for health services and was very positive in its approach to the prison. This approach, along with excellent support from the governor, had brought significant improvements to health services for prisoners. The healthcare manager was extremely positive and innovative and involved staff in decision-making. The healthcare team had undertaken a self-audit to establish its strengths and weaknesses, and there was a clear intention to develop health services for prisoners.
- 4.13 There was an ongoing skill mix review to determine the size and qualifications required to provide appropriate medical and nursing support for prisoners. Because there were nursing vacancies, the PCT had negotiated a six month contract with an agency to provide consistent nursing support and to ensure continuity of care to patients. Prisoners had excellent access to GPs, who held daily clinics. There was a wide range of visiting specialists, including a chiropodist, optician and sexual health specialist. A PCT nurse practitioner oversaw the management of prisoners with long-term illnesses. Named nurses were responsible for older and foreign national prisoners. There were efforts to source health promotion leaflets in other languages. There were good links with external NHS facilities. For example, the pre-operative nurse consultant at the local hospital came to the prison for pre-operative checks on patients. Complaints and unexplained injuries were investigated thoroughly by the healthcare manager.
- 4.14 The healthcare department was open every day, including weekends, from 7.45am until 5.15pm. Prisoners could report sick during these times and be seen by a nurse or the pharmacist. Where necessary they were referred to the GP who they would normally see within 48 hours, or earlier if urgent. There were patient group directives that allowed the pharmacist or nurse to supply prisoners with agreed medication or homely remedies, which included paracetamol. Other remedies, such as cough linctus or throat lozenges, were available from the prison shop.
- 4.15 A pharmacist employed by the PCT attended the prison four days a week, from 9am until 5pm. For two days she worked single-handed and on the other days she was supported by the PCT

medicine management lead, who provided management advice as well as practical help. The pharmacist dispensed all medication to prisoners and was sometimes helped by nursing staff. She also gave prisoners advice and information about their medicines. The service worked well and prisoners felt it had improved greatly since our last inspection. In our survey 50% said the overall quality of the pharmacy service was good or very good, compared with 40% in 2004.

- 4.16 Dental care for prisoners was under great strain, as the dentist had left and a new system was not yet in place. The community dental service provided cover pending a new contract. The dental waiting list was extensive. Although there were three dental sessions a week, more were needed to break the backlog and to introduce a programme of dental health promotion.
- 4.17 There was a weakness in the discharge procedure as not all prisoners were seen routinely by healthcare staff before their release. Those on medication or who asked to be seen before release were always seen, but there was no automatic discharge procedure for all prisoners.
- 4.18 There was a medicines and therapeutic committee, chaired by the PCT lead, which included the pharmacist, a GP, the healthcare manager and the psychiatrist or in-reach manager. It met every two months and minutes were circulated to relevant parties.

Further recommendations

- 4.19 The prison should seek to reduce the number of prisoners who need to attend outside NHS facilities by commissioning more services to come into the prison.
- 4.20 There should be additional dental sessions to reduce the dental waiting list. The new dental services contract should include facilities for dental health promotion.
- 4.21 The healthcare department should set up a discharge plan for all prisoners and provide information on how they can access health and social care services on their release.

Section 5: Activities

Education and library provision

Expected outcomes:

Education provision meets the requirements of the Common Inspection Framework (separately inspected by Ofsted and ALI). Prisoners are encouraged and enabled to learn both during and after sentence, as part of training and sentence planning and have access to good library facilities.

5.1 There should be a clear procedure for recruitment to education and training classes and a transparent framework for managing the waiting lists. (5.14)

Partially achieved. All prisoners received good information and advice on the opportunities for education and training from a member of the education department during induction. Prisoners' preferences and prior achievements were identified and recorded, and they were placed on courses appropriate to their needs, skills and preferences. Prisoners were generally aware of the systems for engaging in learning, and were satisfied that these were fair.

5.2 There were waiting lists for most courses. They were lengthy for some courses, such as art and information and communication technology (ICT), and prisoners had to wait several weeks or longer before they could start learning. In education these lists were reviewed frequently and managed well, and there was little undue delay in moving prisoners on to education programmes as soon as a vacancy rose. However, there was no transparent framework for managing waiting lists for work and vocational areas, apart from engineering. Although staff in employment control were aware of prisoners' allocated activities, they did not use this knowledge actively to manage waiting lists and fill appropriate vacancies in work and vocational training. Procedures for prisoners to change their work were also underdeveloped (see paragraph 5.9).

5.3 Quality assurance procedures should be fully implemented for all areas of learning. (5.15)

Partially achieved. Arrangements for quality assurance in education were good. Prisoner learning had been fully incorporated into the strategic plans of the education contractor, and there were systems that enabled the education department to meet the requirements of the offender learning and skills service (OLASS). Management procedures strongly supported quality improvement, and the arrangements for continuous self-assessment were particularly good. The self-assessment report was revised three times a year and involved all staff. There were good systems for the appraisal and development of staff, and a robust system for classroom observations as part of quality improvement strategies. Prisoners generally were very satisfied with the quality of teaching and learning support. The education department had responded positively to the findings in the Adult Learning Inspectorate (ALI) report of October 2004 and addressed the areas of weakness.

5.4 Quality assurance procedures in the vocational areas were inadequate. There was no monitoring of internal verifier activities, external verifier reports or observation of training. The good practices in education were intended for adoption in the vocational areas, but no meaningful targets had been set to ensure their implementation. The quality improvement

group had produced action plans to address the identified weaknesses and to support self-assessment, but had set no specific relevant targets to monitor progress.

5.5 Individual learning plans should be linked to sentence planning targets and have clear achievable goals. (5.16)

Partially achieved. The education department worked well in partnership with offender assessment system (OASys) staff to ensure that prisoners' individual learning plans were linked effectively to their sentence plans. There was good staff awareness of the processes for managing individual learning plans, and staff involved in developing prisoners' programmes of activities communicated well with each other. Prisoners were interviewed by OASys and education staff and had good opportunities to contribute to their learning plans. Sentence plans and learning plans were well recorded, and any revisions were routinely recorded and circulated to all appropriate staff. In many cases, targets were not individual and not specific enough to guide learning. For example, in one case a prisoner's learning goal was to 'achieve the sentence plan'. Overall, the recording of targets and learning goals was perfunctory, and many targets were not given prescribed timescales for achievement.

5.6 More books to support prisoners' educational studies should be stocked in the library. (5.17)

Achieved. There had been an increase in the number of books to support learning, especially in response to the growth in needs of foreign national prisoners. There were regular meetings between the librarian and the education manager, which had guided spending on new stock to meet prisoners' needs. The library had an extensive stock of reference books, including non-fiction and dictionaries. Many of these provided research material for prisoners on education courses. The stock of 'quick reads' for prisoners with lower reading skills and fiction in 19 languages had increased. There were some books that supported training, but there was no formal system to inform the librarian of books needed to support the learning needs of prisoners in workshops. The library held a range of magazines, some in foreign languages and others with vocational information, such as computing.

5.7 There should be no backlog of prisoners waiting to attend the induction to work course. (5.27)

No longer relevant. This course was no longer offered. A general four-session induction programme was run in the workshops and started the day following reception.

5.8 All prisoners should be allocated work at the end of the induction to work course. (5.28)

Partially achieved. Prisoners were encouraged to apply for work during their induction. The application requested a prisoner to make several choices. During the relevant induction session prisoners had an individual interview with one of the induction workshop instructors who explained the work available in the prison. When they completed induction, prisoners waited seven to ten days on average before they were allocated to work. The establishment had now developed plans for one of the workshops to be an induction allocation shop for prisoners to attend while they awaited their allocation to work.

5.9 All applications for a change of labour should have comments from the interested parties as required on the change of labour forms. (5.29)

Not achieved. Staff said that prisoners who wished to change labour often did so informally, contacting the new employer themselves and asking them to inform labour allocation. This was

accepted if the prisoner's current employer was happy with this. In other instances formal applications only required residential staff to comment, and many of the forms that we reviewed had no comments recorded.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 5.10 The work of the labour board should be reviewed and new terms of reference drawn up that enable it to function as a proactive force directing and monitoring that all prisoners are allocated work, changes of work are justified. (5.30)**

Partially achieved. There were terms of reference for the weekly labour allocation board. This meeting was well attended and reviewed the number of prisoners allocated to each work activity, the target number and the action required to fill all work places. The number of unemployed prisoners was also reviewed. However, as outlined above, changes of labour were not formally controlled by this meeting and, as such, not all changes of work were justified.

- 5.11 Opportunities should be taken to accredit all skills acquired at work to reflect industrial practice and needs for employment. (5.31)**

Not achieved. The number of prisoners registered for accredited training had decreased since 2004. Only 40 prisoners in all workshops and horticulture were working towards any vocational qualifications. In addition, there were no opportunities for literacy and numeracy and key skills accreditation in any of the workshops. The prison's emphasis had been on increasing the number of prisoners employed through expanding external contracts in the workshops. Some accreditation that had been available in 2004 had been put on hold. The national vocational qualification (NVQ) level one in catering had not continued, and there had been no accreditation in the double-glazing workshop in the previous six months due to pressure of orders. No training was available for basic food hygiene certificates for those serving food. There had been no progress in accrediting activities and work in the bicycle repair, electrical assembly, woodcraft and assembly packaging workshops, which employed up to 128 prisoners. Only ten of more than 40 prisoners employed in the engineering workshops worked toward an accredited programme at a time. Employment here required level one literacy before commencement and the prisoner's ability to remain in the workshop for at least six months after they achieved the qualification, which was not possible for those with less time left to serve their sentence. The one area that had been successful was industrial cleaning, where 176 prisoners had achieved a level one cleaning operator's certificate since accredited training had started in August 2005.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 5.12 The range of vocational training programmes should be increased to meet the needs of the population and match skill shortages. (5.32)**

Partially achieved. There had been no work in implementing the action plan following the 2004 inspection as the head of learning and skills had resigned and a new head had only been appointed in June 2006. Progress on increasing the range of vocational programmes had been very slow. One new initiative was a partnership with John Laing Training to provide a multi-skills qualification in construction skills, covering bricklaying, plumbing, painting and decorating and some woodwork. Prisoners were guaranteed a place on their release at the company's training college to complete the level two qualification and gain the Construction Industry Training Board construction site certification scheme (CSCS) card required for working on building sites. There were changes in workshop facilities to prepare for this initiative during the inspection. The prison had recently received centre approval to offer NVQ levels one and two in catering, which had not yet commenced. There were further developments to increase the

accreditation of skills in horticulture and waste management. These new initiatives and reinstatement of training, for example in double-glazing, would increase the accredited opportunities in vocational areas to 106. Even with this improvement, the number of places to meet prisoners' demand for vocational training was still insufficient in a training prison holding 720 men.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 5.13 The education department could accommodate 180 prisoners in the morning and 160 in the afternoon, but was oversubscribed and attended by 295 prisoners, with over 180 at each session. Of these 87 prisoners attended full-time. Attendance at classes during August 2006 was 80%.
- 5.14 The department offered a good range of programmes, including engineering, business start-up, ICT, cookery, and art and design, as well as various social and life skills courses. There were 56 prisoners on higher education courses, many through the Open University. Skills for life and literacy and numeracy were offered at entry levels, and key skills in communication and application of number at levels one and two. There was support for skills for life in group sessions, and for individual prisoners in the care and separation unit (CSU) as outreach provision. The department had responded well to the needs of the foreign national prisoners. There was an adequate number of group sessions in English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) to ensure there were no waiting lists for these courses. A specialist ESOL tutor offered individual support during five sessions a week.
- 5.15 The education department was well managed and there was particularly good support from the contract college staff, who visited the prison frequently. The prisoners were diligent in their studies and enjoyed learning. The department was harmonious and relations between prisoners and staff were good. Prisoners were satisfied with the range of programmes and the learning support. The department had expanded its outreach programme for learning support, but there was no skills for life support in the workshops.
- 5.16 The library was spacious, well equipped and a pleasant facility that was popular with prisoners attending the education department, which it was next to. It had 300-400 visits a week, often by class groups of prisoners. The library was open for 11 sessions weekly, including three evenings. It was managed by a qualified, part-time librarian from Hertfordshire County Council library services, supported by a library assistant. A second assistant librarian had been on long-term sick leave. The library relied heavily on the three prison orderlies to open at its stated times. Library systems were computerised and connected to the Hertfordshire library service system. There was little formal use of the library by groups outside the education department.
- 5.17 The prison had ten workshops that covered manufacture of double-glazed windows and prison cell doors, repair of bicycles, welding, electrical assembly, industrial cleaning, packaging, bricklaying, woodcraft, and resettlement activities provided by an external contractor. The workshops provided a total of 271 places. Other work activities included farm and gardens, waste management and residential wing cleaning. The establishment calculated that it had a total of 702 work and education spaces, which also included prisoners on induction, the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt) course and those working as orderlies throughout the establishment. At the time of our inspection 615 prisoners were employed full-time, 66 had activity for the morning or afternoon only, and 37 were registered as unemployed awaiting allocation.

- 5.18 The workshops were spacious, although not always used to their full potential. In other cases, for example the packaging workshop, there was insufficient contract work to keep the prisoners meaningfully occupied, and they spent much of their time here reading and chatting.

Further recommendations

- 5.19 Procedures for managing the waiting lists for prisoners wishing to engage in work and vocational training should be further developed.
- 5.20 Quality assurance procedures should be fully implemented in all areas of work and vocational training.
- 5.21 The recording of targets should be improved, and learning goals should include SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound) objectives.
- 5.22 All change of labour requests should be formally processed by a work allocation board, which should consider whether the move is appropriate and meets the prisoner's sentence plan and consult all relevant parties.
- 5.23 Prisoners should be purposefully occupied while in the workshops.

Physical education and health promotion

Expected outcome:

Physical education and facilities meet the requirements of the common inspection framework used by Ofsted and the Adult Learning Inspectorate (separately inspected by ALI). Prisoners are also encouraged and enabled to take part in recreational PE, in safe and decent surroundings.

- 5.24 All prisoners should attend the gymnasium induction session. (5.39)

Partially achieved. The gym induction had been split into two component parts. Part one was for all new prisoners and delivered by the gym orderlies in the induction workshop, and part two was in the gym itself, for those prisoners who expressed an interest. As a result, not all the new arrivals saw the facilities or met PE department staff, and opportunities were missed to encourage physical exercise for the more reluctant prisoner.

- 5.25 The target for the number of completions on accredited courses should be significantly raised. (5.40)

Partially achieved. At our last inspection, 12 qualifications had been achieved between April and October 2004 on two accredited courses offered in the gymnasium. This had increased to 47 qualifications achieved on five accredited courses between April and September 2006. The gymnasium had been fully staffed since June 2006 and hoped to offer more courses to substantially increase the qualifications obtained.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 5.26 More than half the population, 57%, used the gymnasium regularly. There were waiting lists for most classes and staff tried to ensure that no prisoner waited longer than two weeks for his chosen session. Prisoners who failed to attend one session or who misbehaved in the gymnasium were banned and removed from the class list. Several prisoners complained about this system, and the establishment planned to monitor this to ensure that no group of prisoners was adversely affected.
- 5.27 There were good facilities, including outdoor areas that were used regularly. The prison was represented in rugby, football and volleyball leagues and external teams visited the establishment.

Further recommendations

- 5.28 All newly received prisoners should complete a gym induction that involves meeting PE staff, including instructors and orderlies, and seeing the facilities and courses on offer.
- 5.29 Prisoners who are removed from the gymnasium and its classes should be formally monitored using SMART data.

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are able to practise their religion fully and in safety. The chaplaincy plays a full part in prison life and contributes to prisoners' overall care, support and resettlement.

- 5.30 **Managers should ensure that prisoners are released from residential units to allow religious services to start on time. (5.45)**

Achieved. Attendance at the main religious services had improved since our previous inspection. Approximately 90 prisoners went to Friday Muslim prayers, 60 to Friday Catholic Mass and 55 to Christian communion on Sundays. A re-profiling of staff in 2005 had incorporated the need for staff to be detailed to supervise prisoners who wished to attend services, and this had enabled services to start on time.

Additional information

- 5.31 There was a multi-faith team coordinated by a full-time Church of England chaplain. The Muslim Chaplain and a Free Church minister were also employed full-time and carried out all statutory duties. An additional Muslim Chaplain was being recruited to meet the needs of the 143 Muslim prisoners held. A range of other ministers was available and all faiths were catered for.
- 5.32 The faith team was well integrated into many areas of prison life and its staff attended many meetings, including the race equality action team and violence reduction meetings.
- 5.33 Faith facilities were very good. There was a large chapel, several group rooms and a large multi-faith area that could accommodate over 200 people.

- 5.34 The responses to our survey from Muslim prisoners were often significantly worse than those from non-Muslim prisoners. For example, 50% of Muslim respondents, compared to 31% of non-Muslims, said they had felt unsafe in the prison, 44% of Muslim respondents, compared to only 20% of non-Muslims, said they had been assaulted or insulted by staff, and 17% of Muslim prisoners stated that they had had insulting remarks made about them, their friends or family by staff compared to only 3% of non-Muslim respondents. However, 85% of Muslim respondents said they could speak to a religious leader of their faith in private compared to 60% of non-Muslim respondents, and 78% said that most staff in the prison treated them with respect.

Further recommendation

- 5.35 Managers should conduct research to ascertain the reasons for the negative perceptions of Muslim prisoners about their treatment by some staff and general issues of safety.

Time out of cell

Expected outcome:

All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in out of cell activities, and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied extra-mural activities.

- 5.36 Prisoners should spend at least ten hours a day out of their cells, except in exceptional circumstances. (5.52)

Achieved. According to the prison's core day, a prisoner who worked full-time and was out on association could achieve up to 11¼ hours out of cell. We interviewed 28 prisoners, including fully employed, part-time employed and unemployed prisoners. From their responses we calculated the average time out of cell as ten hours and 40 minutes for full-time workers but only five hours 55 minutes for unemployed prisoners. As most of the population (85%) were in full-time activity, time out of cell for the majority of prisoners was over ten hours. There were only 37 unemployed prisoners during our inspection, and labour allocation department staff worked hard to ensure that no prisoner who wished to work was left unemployed for long.

- 5.37 The number of cancellations of association should be reduced. (5.53)

Achieved. Cancellation of weekday association was rare and neither staff nor prisoners said this was a problem. Each residential wing had one evening closure a week, but prisoners knew about this and could plan their activities accordingly. Cancellations of weekend association were recorded and prisoners were informed in advance.

- 5.38 Prisoners should be issued with enough warm, waterproof clothing and shoes to go out in all weather conditions. (5.54)

Partially achieved. Although warm clothing was available for prisoners on request, it was not general issue and staff said there was not enough to go around if several prisoners requested it.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 5.39 Out of cell activities, including association and exercise, should be supervised effectively by staff to enable prisoners to feel safe, especially those who may be at risk of self-harm or bullying. (5.55)

Not achieved. Prisoners who returned from work or education could walk around the grounds before lunch or tea, but there were few staff to supervise prisoners who associated at the rear of the residential buildings. Evening association was generally lively but good-humoured. As in 2004, however, we found association rooms with approximately 20-25 prisoners but no staff to supervise them. We also saw prisoners on the upper landings of the old-style units – Ellis, Lakes, Fowler and Brister – with no visible staff supervision. We did not see staff interact with prisoners on association. In our survey only 21% of respondents said that staff spoke to them during association, although this was significantly better than the 13% in 2004.

We repeat the recommendation.

Section 6: Good order

Security and rules

Expected outcomes:

Security and good order are maintained through positive staff–prisoner relationships based on mutual respect as well as attention to physical and procedural matters. Rules and routines are well-publicised, proportionate, fair and encourage responsible behaviour. Categorisation and allocation procedures are based on assessment of a prisoner’s risks and needs; and are clearly explained, fairly applied and routinely reviewed.

- 6.1 There should be a review of the work of the security department to ensure that its staffing and practices are appropriate for the task it needs to address. (6.12)

Achieved. The security department had been restructured and now worked effectively to address relevant tasks. As a result, it had achieved 84% in the latest audit. The department was active in gathering information, and 3,113 security information reports had been submitted in 2006.

- 6.2 The cell searching cycle should be increased. (6.13)

Achieved. The establishment had met its target of searching 183 cells a month for the previous five months. Findings were recorded and there was an intelligence database. However, prisoners complained that staff sometimes left their cells in disarray after a search.

- 6.3 All prisoners should be informed of the rules of the establishment. (6.14)

Partially achieved. Prisoners were given a copy of the establishment rules during their induction, but these were available in English only.

Additional information

- 6.4 The security department was well managed and resourced appropriately. It had introduced an identity card system for prisoners as part of the safer custody officer’s approach to dealing with bullying for shop purchases (see paragraph 7.8). Staff from the department attended all relevant meetings in the establishment. The only concern brought to our attention was from life-sentenced prisoners who complained about the length of time it took the police liaison officer to get clearance for town visits (see recommendation 8.20).

Further recommendation

- 6.5 Security managers should satisfy themselves that staff treat prisoners’ possessions appropriately during cell searches.
-

Additional information - categorisation

- 6.6 Prisoners in our groups raised recategorisation as an issue. Due to the previous backlog of sentence planning, recategorisation was not linked completely to sentence planning although the risk assessments did draw strongly on the risk of harm screening.
- 6.7 We sampled a number of recategorisation reports. The establishment's performance data indicated that 513 prisoners had been reviewed for category D in 2006, of which 55 had been granted. Just 28 out of 363 prisoners considered for recategorisation to category D had been approved in the previous six months. In some months the approval rate had been as low as 7%. Foreign national prisoners were unlikely to get category D status, largely because of the lack of communication from IND and issues about their status. This had resulted in some negative perceptions by foreign national prisoners (see paragraph 3.47). However, the replies were courteous and respectful and explained fully the reasons for the refusal.
- 6.8 Prisoners did not attend boards for category D, although information was drawn from a number of sources including wing and work staff.

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

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

- 6.9 **Prisoners should be given advice on how to appeal against guilty findings at the end of each adjudication. (6.30)**

Achieved. Prisoners were told about the appeals procedure during the adjudication process. In the adjudications we observed prisoners were given an appeals form. There had been 1,107 adjudications in 2006.

- 6.10 **Allegations made against staff during adjudication should be referred for an appropriate investigation and the adjudication adjourned until the result is known. (6.31)**

Achieved. The paperwork we examined showed that allegations made against staff during adjudications were investigated appropriately. The adjudication was adjourned until the investigation was completed.

- 6.11 **The use of the special cell should be reviewed and a local policy devised outlining its use, including the review of all documentation in each case by a senior manager and a formal review of all prisoners held in special accommodation for periods in excess of an hour. (6.32)**

Achieved. The special cell had been used only four times in 2006. The documentation had been completed appropriately on each occasion, and prisoners did not spend excessive time in this cell. There was a clear policy and care and separation unit (CSU) staff were competent in its use.

6.12 Daily records should be kept of the emotional, physical and mental welfare of prisoners held in the segregation unit. (6.33)

Achieved. The CSU held four prisoners at the time of our inspection. The records for these prisoners were of a high standard with daily entries, which we rarely see in other establishments. Reviews took place on time and prisoners took an active part in them. CSU staff were knowledgeable about the prisoners held there.

6.13 Prisoners should have regular access to work or education while held in the segregation unit. (6.34)

Achieved. Education staff visited the unit at least three times a week for classes for prisoners held there. Gym staff also offered classes throughout the week. However, the work offered was mundane.

Additional information

6.14 The CSU bore no resemblance to that which we inspected in 2004. All cells were cleaned to a high standard and had toiletries laid out ready for the next occupant. The general appearance of the unit was among the best we have seen. The establishment had made obvious efforts to ensure the prisoners held there were treated respectfully. However, prisoners had no privacy screens for their in-cell toilet, and were also expected to eat their meals in cells.

6.15 All prisoners located in the CSU were routinely strip searched. No formal risk assessments were carried out to determine whether this process was necessary. Although prisoners who attended the CSU for adjudications were not strip searched, those who applied for protection and subsequently located there were.

6.16 There had been 66 use of force incidents in 2006. On one occasion a prisoner was restrained twice in one day after he claimed to have received injuries. An assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring document was opened on him and he was then placed in a body belt and transferred to Bedford. This incident could have been managed more sensitively and the transfer should have been delayed until the prisoner was in a more stable condition.

Further recommendations

6.17 The employment opportunities for prisoners held in the care and separation unit (CSU) should be more constructive.

6.18 Cells in the CSU should offer the same level of privacy as those on normal location and should include privacy screens.

6.19 Prisoners who are taken to the CSU should not be routinely strip searched without a risk assessment.

6.20 De-escalation techniques should be used in all control and restraint incidents so that the minimum of force is always used.

6.21 Prisoners should not be transferred in a body belt unless they pose an exceptional risk.

Incentives and earned privileges

Expected outcomes:

Incentives and earned privilege schemes are well-publicised, designed to improve behaviour and are applied fairly, transparently and consistently within and between establishments, with regular reviews.

- 6.22 The incentives and earned privileges policy should be rewritten so that it clearly outlines staff and responsibilities at all points in the scheme. (6.42)

Achieved. The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy had been revised and updated several times since our last inspection – most recently in August 2006. The document made clear the action required of various staff, and all the staff we spoke to were able to describe the operation of the scheme confidently.

- 6.23 Prisoners' access to facilities and privileges earned under the incentives and earned privileges scheme should not be restricted by their location. (6.43)

Achieved. The action plan devised in response to our previous recommendations recognised that The Mount had 'retained a hybrid location based IEP scheme' in that two residential units (Fowler and the Annex) were for enhanced prisoners only. However, this did not prevent prisoners on other wings achieving enhanced status, and 61% of the population were on this level at the time of this inspection.

- 6.24 The voluntary testing scheme should not be linked with the incentives and earned privileges scheme. (6.44)

Achieved. See paragraph 8.33. There was a clear differentiation between the compliance and voluntary drug testing (VDT) compacts, and this enabled VDT to remain separate from the IEP system.

- 6.25 Prisoners should be provided with the incentives and earned privileges review board's decision in writing in all instances. (6.45)

Achieved. In most cases prisoners attended their review board. Senior officers who chaired the review boards said that prisoners always received written confirmation of the decision, and we received no complaints from prisoners about this. In our survey 42% said they had been treated fairly in their experience of the IEP scheme, compared to 37% in 2004. However, this was significantly worse than the training prison comparator of 56%.

- 6.26 Managers should review the scheme quarterly to ensure that it is being used as a tool to manage prisoners' behaviour effectively. (6.46)

Achieved. The principal officer with lead responsibility for the IEP policy held regular reviews of the scheme's operation, the facilities list and the policy to identify any areas for change or improvement. Prisoners were consulted through the wing representatives meetings.

Additional information

- 6.27 The IEP scheme was one of the more sophisticated we have seen in recent inspections. The rules were applied flexibly to respond appropriately to the needs and circumstances of individual prisoners. We saw examples where prisoners were not demoted even when they had accumulated the required level of warnings, and where prisoners were removed from basic regime in advance of the set review date. All these cases were supported by well-reasoned arguments. The overriding objective was to manage the prisoner in a manner likely to secure his compliance and motivation. The only exception to this approach was automatic demotion for acts that were most likely to threaten the good order of the prison – violence and possession of mobile telephones or drugs. However, there was an apparent inconsistency: prisoners who gave a positive MDT on reception faced automatic demotion, while positive MDTs at any other time triggered a review of IEP status rather than automatic demotion.
- 6.28 The downside of an individualised system was that some prisoners perceived it as unfair and potentially discriminatory. We received complaints about the overzealous manner in which some staff issued IEP warnings. Managers acknowledged that some, predominantly newer, staff still operated ‘according to the book’ rather than applying appropriate discretion. Although there were checks and appeal processes, these did little to reassure disaffected prisoners. In our survey 55% of black and minority ethnic (BME) respondents were on the enhanced level of the IEP scheme, compared to 80% of white respondents, and only just over a third felt they had been treated fairly in their experience of the scheme, compared to just over half of white respondents.
- 6.29 There were normally only a few prisoners on basic regime – four at the time of the inspection. Although there were no structured interventions to help them change their behaviour, most remained on basic level for only a short time. As we would expect in a training prison, failure to attend work or education was dealt with robustly in the IEP scheme, and all enhanced status prisoners were in work.

Further recommendation

- 6.30 A positive mandatory drug test (MDT) result following transfer should not automatically result in the prisoner’s loss of enhanced status. An incentives and earned privileges review board should be convened to look into the circumstances of each case.

Section 7: Services

Catering

Expected outcome:

Prisoners are offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements and food is prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations.

- 7.1 All kitchen equipment should be fully functioning and a maintenance schedule should be put in place to ensure this. (7.5)

Achieved. All broken equipment had been repaired or replaced. New contractors were responsible for the maintenance of equipment and, although there could be some delays, the kitchen was usually able to function adequately. An alternative kitchen area was available if needed in an emergency.

- 7.2 Food trolleys should not be taken from the kitchen to the wing serveries before the appointed time. (7.6)

Achieved. Notices in the kitchen specified the times when trolleys were to leave the kitchen and we saw no instances where food was collected early.

- 7.3 Wing serveries should be cleaned to the satisfaction of the catering manager and should be reviewed periodically by the local environmental health officer. (7.7)

Achieved. Kitchen staff attended the serveries daily and wing managers completed monthly checks; all these were documented. An inter-serveries competition had helped maintain high standards of cleanliness and the serveries were well presented. The prison's health and safety officer regularly visited the serveries and the environmental health inspector had last visited in January 2006.

- 7.4 The weekly servery journal should be properly completed, legibly signed for and audited by senior managers. (7.8)

Achieved. We were shown up-to-date and complete records that met all these requirements.

Additional information

- 7.5 The kitchen staff continued to provide a wide range of good quality food, and took advantage of special offers from local suppliers to ensure the menu was varied and not repetitive. The level of prisoner satisfaction with the food had doubled since our 2004 survey, and 38% of all respondents to our survey now rated the food as good or very good – as did 46% of black and minority ethnic (BME) respondents. A number of BME prisoners worked in the kitchen, although this allocation was not intentional. Several of the kitchen orderlies were clearly proud of the dishes they produced. The menu selection sheets reflected high demand particularly for African and Eastern-based dishes. There was a monthly food representatives meeting to obtain ideas and feedback, but the twice-yearly food survey received a very poor response (around 5%).

- 7.6 Although the kitchen could take up to 24 prisoners as workers, less than half that number worked in the kitchen at any time – a reflection of high employment levels in the prison and competing demands, such as part-time education. The national vocational qualification (NVQ) training programme introduced just before the last inspection had been discontinued and no prisoners who worked in catering had the opportunity to achieve nationally recognised qualifications (see recommendation 5.11).

Prison shop

Expected outcome:

Prisoners can purchase a suitable range of goods at reasonable prices to meet their ethnic, cultural and gender needs, and can do so safely, from an effectively managed shop.

- 7.7 The shop ordering system should be reviewed to ensure that prisoners are able to access accurate and up-to-date records of their finances and that new arrivals to the prison can purchase items from the shop within their first week. (7.14)

Achieved. The shop ordering system had been restructured to speed up the process and to minimise delays. As a result, prisoners who arrived any day up until a Wednesday received their shop order that week.

- 7.8 Security and safety concerns about the shop operation should be addressed as part of the safer custody strategy, in particular to reduce the opportunities for bullying. (7.15)

Achieved. The safety of prisoners' purchases and protection for more vulnerable prisoners had been improved with the introduction of personal identity cards for prisoners. Prisoners had to show their cards to confirm their identity when they collected shop orders. Shop orders were transported in locked boxes to enhance safety. Prisoners also now had lockable boxes in their cells to secure more valuable goods and medications.

Additional information

- 7.9 The shop had returned to direct prison management after the contractor had failed to deliver to standard. A wide range of goods was available and the choice was enhanced by fresh and frozen goods for prisoners to use in the wing kitchens. There were clear arrangements to separate Halal items. Staff in the shop included prisoners and they worked hard to make up bagged goods for prisoner orders.
- 7.10 Some items that had previously only been available through catalogue orders could now be bought directly from the prison shop, and this range of goods was to be extended.

Section 8: Resettlement

Resettlement strategy

Expected outcome:

Resettlement underpins the work of the whole establishment, supported by strategic partnerships in the community and informed by assessment of prisoner risk and need so as to minimise the likelihood of reoffending on release.

- 8.1 **An up-to-date resettlement strategy should be devised based on a comprehensive population profile and should address the specific needs of the population held at The Mount. (8.4)**

Achieved. The resettlement strategy had been replaced in 2006 with a strategic pathways document. This mirrored the ten resettlement pathways and linked them to specific provision in The Mount. Although there had been no resettlement needs analysis, the establishment had undertaken specific work on domestic violence and the psychology department had made a full population review in December 2005. The assessment and reintegration manager could also analyse data for prisoners who had been offender assessment system (OASys) assessed and identify housing, employment and substance misuse needs and criminogenic factors.

- 8.2 **The gap left by the departure of Prison Service Plus and the imminent departure of Education and Youth Services should be identified and addressed. (8.5)**

Achieved. The change in the population meant that many long-term prisoners were no longer eligible for Prison Service Plus, which had been discontinued. The Foundation Training Company, which had been at the prison since 2003, had expanded, relocated to a larger venue, employed prisoner advisers and taken on additional staff (see paragraph 8.6).

Additional information

- 8.3 Since our last inspection resettlement work had undergone significant change. The role of head of resettlement had changed to offender management, and the establishment had restructured to meet the offender management model. A senior manager had the specific task of assessment and reintegration. He had overall responsibility for all aspects of offender management, from liaising with external agencies to managing interventions.
- 8.4 There were good links with outside probation departments and the establishment was well prepared for its offender supervisor role, which was now due to start in 2007. The one area of weakness was the underdevelopment of resettlement provision for the high number of foreign national prisoners (see paragraph 3.44). However, there were good strategic links with external agencies such as HACRO (Hertfordshire Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders), Shelter, Jobcentre Plus and other local voluntary groups. The Citizens Advice Bureau visited twice a week.
- 8.5 In our survey respondents indicated a good awareness of resettlement services with responses on getting help with benefits, housing, employment and training significantly higher than the training prison comparator. RESET (resettlement prisoners offering advice

and guidance) services were well advertised, and a range of posters, leaflets and other information on resettlement provision were displayed on the wings.

- 8.6 The Foundation Training Company occupied a large workshop and offered a range of services. Its focus was the provision of a five week, full-time accredited course, which included preparation for work, financial literacy, personal development and group and teamwork. This was supplemented by individual advice and guidance from two experienced resettlement workers, a job point terminal linked into employment opportunities on release, business planning, construction industry health and safety tests, and a Learndirect site due to open in November 2006. It employed several prisoners, with whom an national vocational qualification (NVQ) level three in advice and guidance was being piloted. These prisoners were motivated and knowledgeable, although they were unable to use the telephone in the course of their work, which restricted their potential as peer advisers.
- 8.7 A further workshop accommodated an advice centre staffed by a team of prisoner advisers (RESET workers) and supervised by an officer employed full-time on this project. This provision had developed significantly in the last two years. The RESET team saw prisoners on induction and provided advice on benefits and other aspects of resettlement provision, such as home detention curfew (HDC), release on temporary licence (ROTL) and transfer to category D status. Citizens Advice Bureau workers visited the establishment twice a week and offered a service that mirrored that available in the community. RESET prisoner advisers were also unable to use the telephone, and cases that required complex staff intervention were normally referred to the Foundation Training Company.

Further recommendation

- 8.8 Subject to security checks and proper oversight, prisoner resettlement advisers should be allowed to use the telephone to contact external agencies and advocate on behalf of their clients.

Offender behaviour programmes

Expected outcomes:

Effective programmes are available to address the identified risks and needs of prisoners, to allow timely progression through sentence.

- 8.9 Sentence management unit staff should be detailed their allocated hours so that sentence planning can be conducted. (8.12)

Achieved. There was a minimum staffing level for work on offender assessment system (OASys) and there were never less than two officers detailed to this work during the core day. Three probation support officers supplemented this. OASys was well managed by a dedicated senior manager and senior officer and met all internal and external targets.

- 8.10 All sentence plans should be countersigned and a proportion should be quality checked by a senior manager to ensure that an appropriate standard is delivered. All sections should be completed and targets should be individually focused. (8.13)

Achieved. A third of the prisoners at The Mount had sentence plans drawn up by the offender management unit, and the senior manager of assessment and interventions monitored these regularly. There were systems to highlight missing information, and 10% of

OASys assessments were quality checked. Although some documentation from other establishments had been missing or incomplete, the overall standard of sentence plans was good.

8.11 An effective referral system should be established to ensure that courses are systematically offered to those who require them.

Achieved. The yearly target for offending behaviour programmes completions, which included enhanced thinking skills (ETS) and controlling anger and learning to manage it (CALM), was 72. There were 44 prisoners on the waiting list for ETS and 66 for CALM. These waiting lists were linked to the offender management unit database, and prisoners were prioritised for the programmes on the basis of their risk of harm in their OASys screening rather than their release date. Priority and prolific offenders also received priority for courses. The establishment had withdrawn the opportunity for prisoners to self-refer to programmes in order to prioritise the most needy.

8.12 The tutor pool should be expanded to retain its multidisciplinary form.

Achieved. The tutor pool included one prison officer, one probation support officer and four psychology staff. Although there had been some staff turnover the team had stabilised, and the establishment had performed well in the external accreditation of ETS and CALM.

Additional information

8.13 Sentence planning had featured very poorly at the last inspection. This had changed significantly. In our survey 51% of respondents, compared with only 22% in 2004 and the 46% comparator for training prisons, said they felt very involved with their sentence plan. A total of 87% of the population had some form of sentence plan, and 73% had an OASys assessment. The prison managed information effectively and was well ahead of its OASys targets, despite the many prisoners who arrived from other establishments without a sentence plan.

Life-sentenced prisoners

Expected outcomes:

Life-sentenced prisoners should receive equal treatment in terms of their treatment and the conditions in which they are held. These expectations refer to specific issues, which relate to the management of life-sentenced prisoners.

8.14 All staff working with life-sentenced prisoners, particularly their personal officers, should be properly trained. (8.21)

Achieved. All the personal officers for life-sentenced prisoners were now properly trained. However, life-sentenced prisoners complained that these staff were unhelpful and referred their requests on to the lifer manager.

8.15 Personal officers' written contributions to review boards should be insightful and comprehensively cover the work and behaviour of the prisoner concerned. (8.22)

Not achieved. Personal officer contributions were uninformative and lacked comprehensive conclusions about the prisoners in their care. There was little reference to offending

behaviour work or any progress made.
We repeat the recommendation.

8.16 Personal officers should attend review boards. (8.23)

Not achieved. Personal officers did not attend review boards on a regular basis.
We repeat the recommendation.

8.17 Lifer days should be introduced as a means of involving families in preparation for release. (8.24)

Achieved. Prisoners praised the efforts of the lifer manager in arranging lifer days, which involved families, and said this had built up relationships between staff and prisoners. Two lifer days had already been held in 2006 and more were planned.

Additional information

8.18 There were currently 37 life-sentenced prisoners. The establishment was unclear about the number of recalls. The life-sentenced prisoners we spoke to were interested in the reintroduction of lifer meetings as a forum to raise their concerns formally. Life-sentenced prisoners were frustrated at the time it took the establishment to approve town visits; some cases were out of date by six months. They felt the establishment lacked relevant facilities or courses for life-sentenced prisoners and that progression was limited.

8.19 The full-time lifer manager was sometimes redeployed to other tasks and had only part-time administration cover. This was not sufficient to meet the needs of the lifer population

Further recommendations

8.20 The backlog for organising town visits should be reduced, as should the backlog in review boards.

8.21 The lifer manager should not be redeployed to cover other tasks, and administration support should be increased to a full-time post.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcome:

Prisoners are supported to return to the community in safety and dignity, using community and family links and appropriate licence and curfew arrangements to meet their practical needs and maximise the prospects for avoiding reoffending on release.

8.22 The use of release on temporary licence should be increased to assist prisoners in preparing a structured release plan. (8.41)

Not achieved. The systems to assess prisoners who applied for release on temporary licence (ROTL) were sound and well managed but ROTL was underused, although 207 prisoners had been released directly into the community in the previous year. Prisoners released at the end of long sentences were not routinely assessed for a period of

resettlement. ROTL was used mainly for prisoners who worked in the outside gardens or to allow prisoners to attend hospital appointments with a single officer.

8.23 The backlog of parole cases should be eliminated. (8.42)

Achieved. Since the beginning of March 2006, 59 parole dossiers had been submitted to the Parole Board, all of which were completed on time. The offender management unit had its own internal targets and had achieved these, despite the reduced numbers of seconded probation staff since the last inspection.

8.24 The low approval rate of home detention curfew cases should be monitored and reviewed. (8.43)

Achieved. Home detention curfew (HDC) arrangements had been reviewed since the last inspection. Assessment for HDC was now based on a point scoring system, which provided good and objective consistency of assessments. However, due to the change in population the number of HDC licences had fallen from 166 considered in 2004-05 to just 63 in 2005-06. However, the percentage rate for approval had risen sharply, which suggested that prisoners eligible for HDC had an increased likelihood of success.

8.25 Security clearance for Jobcentre Plus workers should be pursued. (8.44)

Achieved. Two Jobcentre Plus workers visited each week and full security clearance had been obtained.

Additional information

8.26 The pressures on the prison population meant that the prison no longer routinely held a number of category D prisoners (up to eight) to work in the outside mess or as outside gardeners. Recent Prison Service instructions had exhorted establishments to move all suitable prisoners to category D establishments, irrespective of their time left to serve. This, combined with some security issues about contraband brought into the establishment, had resulted in a decline in the use of ROTL. Since April 2006, three ROTL licences had been approved out of 15 applications considered, most to facilitate activities not connected with resettlement (see paragraph 8.22). This compared with 44 considered and 28 approved at the time of our last inspection. Since April 2006, 68 prisoners had been released, many on conditional release or non-parole sentences, and most had not been considered for temporary release before discharge.

Further recommendation

8.27 Prisoners due for release should be considered for release on temporary licence (ROTL) as part of the resettlement process.

Public protection

Expected outcomes:

Arrangements are in place to assess and manage the risks presented to the public by prisoners during sentence and after release. Clear systems operate to ensure that all affected

prisoners are fully informed of the arrangements, the implications for them individually and the avenues available to them for challenge.

- 8.28 **Public protection policies and procedures that incorporate an inter-agency information sharing protocol and specifically address risk reduction should be drawn up. (8.51)**

Achieved. The public protection policy had been rewritten and covered all key areas. The relevant operational instruction included comprehensive information to staff and the relevant information. There was an extensive database and routine bi-monthly inter-departmental risk management panel meetings. This panel had the responsibility to develop and review risk management plans of those prisoners identified as falling under the multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) procedure. This included individual prisoner risk assessments, sharing information on risk assessments and drawing up risk management plans. All key departments were represented and attended regularly.

- 8.29 **Individual risk assessments should be based on the full range of available information and a structured risk assessment tool. (8.52)**

Achieved. See paragraph 8.28.

Additional information

- 8.30 At the time of the inspection nine prisoners were assessed at MAPPA level three and a further 126 at level two. A public protection sifting panel met weekly to consider the risk of all the receptions in the previous two weeks. A single file ensured that information was shared between probation and Prison Service staff. The prison was represented at the local Hertfordshire multi-agency public protection strategic panel.

Substance use

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners with substance-related needs are identified at reception and receive effective support and treatment throughout their stay in custody, including pre-release planning. All prisoners are safe from exposure to and the effects of substance use while in prison.

- 8.31 **The drug strategy team should closely monitor the drug supply reduction action plan and implement a working timetable to implement action points. (8.65)**

Achieved. The supply reduction plan was part of the establishment's drug strategy. Its implementation was monitored by the drug strategy committee, at which security staff were well represented. The drug strategy coordinator ensured that supply and demand reduction initiatives were integrated. Specific measures to tackle drug supply included increased mandatory drug testing (MDT), improved intelligence systems and police liaison, perimeter fence monitoring, a comprehensive searching strategy, and the use of passive and active drug dogs. In August 2006 there had been 12 drug finds, eight prisoners were on closed visits, and six visitors had been banned. Despite these measures, 31% of respondents to our survey said it was easy to get hold of illegal drugs in the prison, compared to the training prison comparator of 26%.

8.32 A uniformed officer should be detailed to assist the RAPt team. (8.66)

Achieved. An officer had been detailed to the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt) programme. She arranged prisoner movements on and off the wing, completed assessments and co-facilitated some of the groups. She could be redeployed to escort duties, but this was monitored.

8.33 In conjunction with the area drug coordinator, the drug strategy coordinator should review staffing arrangements for voluntary drug testing to ensure consistent delivery. (8.67)

Achieved. A dedicated voluntary drug testing (VDT) coordinator had been appointed, and over 70% of officers had been trained in the procedure. In August 2006 there were 362 compacts, against a target of 300, and there had been 559 tests. The level of testing could exceed 600 a month, and this was achieved by a single officer. Although there were comprehensive protocols and procedures for single officer testing, this practice raised concerns about prisoner and officer safety. VDT mainly took place on the designated voluntary testing unit, Brister, which had 114 spaces. A positive test resulted in a review, which included treatment staff. Prisoners on general location could access testing, but this was not well advertised. Those on the enhanced units and trusted workers were required to sign up to compliance testing, and separate compacts had been developed. There were designated testing areas.

8.34 Weekend and targeted testing should take place on a regular basis. (8.68)

Achieved. Two designated MDT officers worked flexible hours, and testing had increased significantly. Weekend testing targets were consistently achieved, and there was a high level of reception, risk, suspicion and frequent testing. In the week of the inspection, 39 prisoners were on the frequent testing programme for using a class A drug. The year-to-date rate of random positives stood at 6%, mainly for opiates, but this did not include prisoners on frequent testing. All prisoners who tested positive were referred to the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) team. MDT officers attended drug strategy meetings and worked well with the treatment providers.

Additional information

8.35 A well-managed drug strategy was led by the drug strategy manager (who was also the deputy head of the offender management unit), assisted by a principal and senior officer. Attendance at the monthly drug strategy meetings showed its high profile in the establishment and included local drug intervention programme (DIP) representation. There was a good level of joint strategic and operational work. The policy was comprehensive, and stakeholders had been consulted in a recent review. A six-monthly needs analysis underpinned the strategy. Alcohol services were included in the committee's remit, although a local alcohol strategy had not yet been developed.

8.36 New arrivals had completed detoxification at a local establishment. The prison currently lacked the expertise and the protocols to accept prisoners on methadone maintenance. There was a benzodiazepine reduction protocol, but no clinical management guidelines for secondary detoxification for opiate users. Prisoners who used and tested positive for opiates had only a flu-pack for symptom relief, which was inadequate. A previous GP had prescribed methadone to three prisoners, but this was discontinued because of the lack of appropriate systems. There were joint working protocols with CARATs and RAPt, and weekly multidisciplinary case reviews included mental health in-reach team and safer custody staff.

- 8.37 CARAT service staff included a manager, four drug workers from Alcohol and Drug Addiction Prevention and Treatment (ADAPT) and administrative support. The team provided induction input twice weekly and was on target to meet its reduced assessment key performance target of 225. In August 2006 the service carried an open caseload of 253, and there was no waiting list. Validated group work modules had been introduced in April 2006 and included drug and alcohol awareness, overdose prevention and relapse prevention. One-to-one counselling could be arranged through the chaplaincy. The CARAT service was well integrated into the prison, and represented at appropriate internal meetings. It had links with a wide range of DIPs, and in particular with the local one. The education department offered alcohol awareness and alcohol and offending courses, which were Open College Network accredited. There were weekly Alcoholics Anonymous groups.
- 8.38 Prisoners who needed intensive intervention could go on the five to six month RAPt programme based on the 12-steps approach. This took place on C and D spurs of Brister, but not completely separated from the rest of the unit. The programme was well established and managed, and the team worked closely with healthcare, CARATs and the VDT coordinator. In 2005, the target of 100 starts and 60 completions had been met, but this would be difficult to meet in 2006 because of the more static population. The programme was well advertised internally and to other establishments. Seven external candidates awaited assessment and transfer, but transport difficulties often caused delays. Post-programme support included daily Narcotics Anonymous meetings and a good peer support scheme. Peer supporters suggested that increased family involvement would be helpful. In our survey 46% said the drug/alcohol programme had been helpful, compared to 35% in similar establishments.

Further recommendations

- 8.39 The establishment should devise a local alcohol strategy.
- 8.40 The practice of single officer voluntary drug testing should cease.
- 8.41 The voluntary drug testing programme should be advertised to prisoners on all wings.
- 8.42 Appropriate policies and procedures for opiate users requiring secondary detoxification should be developed in consultation with specialist advisers.
- 8.43 The prison should provide separate, self-contained accommodation for the RAPt (Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust) programme.
- 8.44 The national drug programme delivery unit should review RAPt programme targets in the light of population changes.
- 8.45 The drug strategy team should explore increased family involvement for prisoners completing the RAPt programme.

Summary of recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice

The following is a list of both repeated and further recommendations included in this report. The reference numbers in brackets refer to the paragraph location in the main report.

Main recommendations To the governor

- 9.1 All newly received prisoners should experience comprehensive first night and induction procedures. (MR1)

Recommendations To NOMS

- 9.2 Cell designed for single occupancy should not be used as doubles. (2.1)
- 9.3 Clarification should be provided on category D status for foreign national prisoners to ensure transparency and reduce prisoner frustrations. (3.54)

Recommendations To Immigration and Nationality Directorate

- 9.4 Prisoners awaiting deportation past the sentence expiry date should be transferred to immigration removal centres. (3.55)

Recommendations To the area manager

- 9.5 The national drug programme delivery unit should review RAPt programme targets in the light of population changes. (8.44)

Recommendations To the governor

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 9.6 Regular dialogue should take place at an appropriate level between prison and escort staff to allow issues of concern to be raised and best practice developed. (1.1)
- 9.7 Prisoners should be held in reception for as short a time as possible. (1.5)
- 9.8 The strip searching area in reception should offer complete privacy. (1.6)

First days in custody

- 9.9 All newly arrived prisoners should have the opportunity to meet staff from their residential unit to discuss any fears or concerns. This should be done in private and in a relaxed environment. (1.8)

- 9.10 Prisoners should be fully occupied during the induction period. Induction should be completed within the prescribed time, and on completion prisoners should be allocated to a work activity that keeps them fully occupied throughout the working day. (1.14)
- 9.11 The induction booklet should be in plain English, appropriate to the literacy levels of the population. (1.15)
- 9.12 The induction booklet should be available in a range of appropriate languages. (1.16)

Residential units

- 9.13 Each wing should have the same level of recreational facilities. (2.3)
- 9.14 All in-cell toilets should be effectively screened to ensure privacy. (2.5)
- 9.15 Prisoners should be able to have items on the prison's facility list sent in through the post and handed in on visits. (2.15)
- 9.16 There should be a clear evacuation protocol for prisoners who are disabled. Staff should be fully aware of this protocol and prisoners should not be made responsible for the evacuation of disabled prisoners. (2.16)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 9.17 Staff should engage with prisoners, particularly during association and exercise time, and contribute to the quality of prisoners' free time. (2.18)

Personal officers

- 9.18 Management should ensure that personal officers perform their role satisfactorily, and that contact with prisoners is reflected in a chronological diary of meaningful contact in wing history sheets. (2.23)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 9.19 The central register of bullies in the control room should be verified daily by the safer custody manager or a nominated member of staff in their absence. (3.9)
- 9.20 Arrangements should be put in place to support and encourage greater prisoner representation at the safer custody meetings. (3.10)
- 9.21 There should be a consistent approach to how wing managers manage bullying documentation, and the safer custody senior officer should be consulted before any bullying document is closed. (3.11)
- 9.22 There should be interventions for bullies and victims, based on best practice in other prisons. (3.12)

Self-harm and suicide

- 9.23 The Listener suite should be maintained to a satisfactory standard, providing a relaxing environment for prisoners in distress. (3.22)

Race equality

- 9.24 The quality of investigations into racist incident complaints should be improved and training in investigation techniques and procedures provided to the race relations liaison officer. (3.33)
- 9.25 Research should be conducted immediately into the reasons for the negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic prisoners (BME). A steering group, involving prisoners and external agencies, should be established. Results should be widely publicised to improve perceptions among this group and any necessary remedial action taken. (3.34)
- 9.26 A simplified and shortened version of the results of the SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound) race analysis data should be publicised throughout the prison and accessible to all prisoners. (3.35)
- 9.27 The race equality officer should attend investigations officer training as a matter of urgency. (3.36)

Foreign national prisoners

- 9.28 All staff should be aware of the basic entitlement for foreign national prisoners outlined in the foreign national policy. (3.49)
- 9.29 All foreign national prisoners should automatically receive a free telephone call home if they do not receive visits, and should not be required to apply for this entitlement each month. (3.50)
- 9.30 There should be additional resources to assist in the management of foreign national prisoners. (3.51)
- 9.31 The Immigration and Nationality Directorate (IND) and Detention Advice Service (DAS) should be requested to attend the prison more frequently. (3.52)
- 9.32 There should be greater use of professional translation and interpretation services, which should be more widely publicised to staff. Key documents should be translated into the most appropriate languages. Information on prisoners and staff who speak foreign languages should be available to all staff. (3.53)

Contact with the outside world

- 9.33 Visitors should be able to book future visits while they are at the prison. (3.60)

Applications and complaints

- 9.34 There should be a system to quality check the responses to prisoner applications. (3.66)

- 9.35 All interim replies to complaints should be followed up by a full response. A copy of this should be attached to the original complaint for any monitoring or audit of the timeliness or quality of responses. (3.67)
- 9.36 A central register of complaints against staff should be maintained and monitored for emerging patterns or trends. (3.68)

Legal rights

- 9.37 A pool of staff should receive current training in legal services. (3.69)
- 9.38 The provision of legal services should be publicised and coordinated. (3.70)
- 9.39 Legal services staff should be given a minimum of five detailed hours a week, and staff should be identified to cover in their absence. (3.72)
- 9.40 The application system should clearly record if a prisoner has been assisted with his legal matters. (3.73)

Health services

- 9.41 The healthcare application system should be reviewed and application forms placed in a dedicated healthcare box rather than being posted through the internal mail system. (4.3)
- 9.42 The prison should seek to reduce the number of prisoners who need to attend outside NHS facilities by commissioning more services to come into the prison. (4.19)
- 9.43 There should be additional dental sessions to reduce the dental waiting list. The new dental services contract should include facilities for dental health promotion. (4.20)
- 9.44 The healthcare department should set up a discharge plan for all prisoners and provide information on how they can access health and social care services on their release. (4.21)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 9.45 All applications for a change of labour should have comments from the interested parties as required on the change of labour forms. (5.9)
- 9.46 Opportunities should be taken to accredit all skills acquired at work to reflect industrial practice and needs for employment. (5.11)
- 9.47 The range of vocational training programmes should be increased to meet the needs of the population and match skill shortages. (5.12)
- 9.48 Procedures for managing the waiting lists for prisoners wishing to engage in work and vocational training should be further developed. (5.19)
- 9.49 Quality assurance procedures should be fully implemented in all areas of work and vocational training. (5.20)
- 9.50 The recording of targets should be improved, and learning goals should include SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound) objectives. (5.21)

- 9.51 All change of labour requests should be formally processed by a work allocation board, which should consider whether the move is appropriate and meets the prisoner's sentence plan and consult all relevant parties. (5.22)
- 9.52 Prisoners should be purposefully occupied while in the workshops. (5.23)

Physical education and health promotion

- 9.53 The target for the number of completions on accredited courses should be significantly raised. (5.25)
- 9.54 All newly received prisoners should complete a gym induction that involves meeting PE staff, including instructors and orderlies, and seeing the facilities and courses on offer. (5.28)
- 9.55 Prisoners who are removed from the gymnasium and its classes should be formally monitored using SMART data. (5.29)

Faith and religious activity

- 9.56 Managers should conduct research to ascertain the reasons for the negative perceptions of Muslim prisoners about their treatment by some staff and general issues of safety. (5.35)

Time out of cell

- 9.57 Prisoners should be issued with enough warm, waterproof clothing and shoes to go out in all weather conditions. (5.38)
- 9.58 Out of cell activities, including association and exercise, should be supervised effectively by staff to enable prisoners to feel safe, especially those who may be at risk of self-harm or bullying. (5.39)

Security and rules

- 9.59 Security managers should satisfy themselves that staff treat prisoners' possessions appropriately during cell searches. (6.5)

Discipline

- 9.60 The employment opportunities for prisoners held in the care and separation unit (CSU) should be more constructive. (6.17)
- 9.61 Cells in the CSU should offer the same level of privacy as those on normal location and should include privacy screens. (6.18)
- 9.62 Prisoners who are taken to the CSU should not be routinely strip searched without a risk assessment. (6.19)
- 9.63 De-escalation techniques should be used in all control and restraint incidents so that the minimum of force is always used. (6.20)

- 9.64 Prisoners should not be transferred in a body belt unless they pose an exceptional risk. (6.21)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 9.65 A positive mandatory drug test (MDT) result following transfer should not automatically result in the prisoner's loss of enhanced status. An incentives and earned privileges review board should be convened to look into the circumstances of each case. (6.30)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 9.66 Subject to security checks and proper oversight, prisoner resettlement advisers should be allowed to use the telephone to contact external agencies and advocate on behalf of their clients. (8.8)

Life-sentenced prisoners

- 9.67 Personal officers' written contributions to review boards should be insightful and comprehensively cover the work and behaviour of the prisoner concerned. (8.15)
- 9.68 Personal officers should attend review boards. (8.16)
- 9.69 The backlog for organising town visits should be reduced, as should the backlog in review boards. (8.20)
- 9.70 The lifer manager should not be redeployed to cover other tasks, and administration support should be increased to a full-time post. (8.21)

Reintegration planning

- 9.71 Prisoners due for release should be considered for release on temporary licence (ROTL) as part of the resettlement process. (8.27)

Substance use

- 9.72 The establishment should devise a local alcohol strategy. (8.39)
- 9.73 The practice of single officer voluntary drug testing should cease. (8.40)
- 9.74 The voluntary drug testing programme should be advertised to prisoners on all wings. (8.41)
- 9.75 Appropriate policies and procedures for opiate users requiring secondary detoxification should be developed in consultation with specialist advisers. (8.42)
- 9.76 The prison should provide separate, self-contained accommodation for the RAPt (Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust) programme. (8.43)
- 9.77 The drug strategy team should explore increased family involvement for prisoners completing the RAPt programme. (8.45)

Examples of good practice

- 9.78 All cells had curtains as well as metal lockers for prisoners to secure their possessions, and there were individual cubicles in all shower areas. (2.17)
- 9.79 Listeners had unrestricted access to all residential units, which allowed them to be available to prisoners at all times and not just in response to immediate crises. (3.23)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nigel Newcomen	-	Deputy Chief Inspector
Francis Masserick	-	Team leader
Hayley Folland	-	Inspector
Janine Harrison	-	Inspector
Gail Hunt	-	Inspector
John Simpson	-	Inspector

Specialist inspectors

Siggi Engelen	-	Substance use
Bridget McEvilly	-	Healthcare
Members of the Adult Learning Inspectorate		

Researchers

Samantha Booth
Julia Fossi
Amy Summerfield

Appendix II: Prison population profile

(i) Status	Number	%
Sentenced	712	99
Detainees (single power status)	4	1
Total	716	100

(ii) Sentence	Number	%
12 months-less than 2 years	1	0
2 years-less than 4 years	22	3
4 years-less than 10 years	612	85
10 years and over (not life)	44	6
Life	37	5
Total	716	100

(iii) Length of stay	Number	%
Less than 1 month	51	7
1 month to 3 months	88	12
3 months to 6 months	143	20
6 months to 1 year	186	26
1 year to 2 years	192	27
2 years to 4 years	55	8
4 years or more	1	0
Total	716	100

(iv) Main offence	Number	%
Violence against the person	145	20
Sexual offences	5	1
Burglary	59	8
Robbery	87	12
Theft and handling	10	1
Fraud and forgery	16	2
Drugs offences	298	42
Other offences	93	13

Offence not recorded/ Holding warrant	3	0
Total	716	99

(v) Age	Number	%
21 years to 29 years	287	40
30 years to 39 years	250	35
40 years to 49 years	127	18
50 years to 59 years	41	6
60 years to 69 years	10	1
70 plus years: <i>maximum age - 76</i>	1	0
Total	716	100

(vi) Home address	Number	%
Within 50 miles of the prison	587	82
Between 50 and 100 miles of the prison	112	16
Over 100 miles from the prison	17	2
Total	716	100

(vii) Nationality	Number	%
British	417	58
Foreign nationals	299	42
Total	716	100

(viii) Ethnicity	Number	%
<i>White:</i>		
British	217	30
Irish	11	2
Other White	64	9
<i>Mixed:</i>		
White and Black Caribbean	22	3
White and Black African	2	0
White and Asian	3	0
Other Mixed	10	1
<i>Asian or Asian British:</i>		
Indian	16	2

Pakistani	15	2
Bangladeshi	8	1
Other Asian	20	3
<i>Black or Black British:</i>		
Caribbean	194	27
African	91	13
Other Black	26	4
<i>Chinese or other ethnic group:</i>		
Chinese	2	0
Other ethnic group	10	1
<i>Not stated</i>	5	1
Total	716	100

(ix) Religion	Number	%
Baptist	4	1
Church of England	142	20
Roman Catholic	138	19
Other Christian denominations	77	11
Muslim	185	26
Sikh	9	1
Hindu	9	1
Buddhist	11	2
Jewish	5	1
Other	16	2
No religion	120	17
Total	716	100

Appendix III: Racist incident report forms

The inspection team was given 106 closed racist incident report forms for April – August 2006. Thirty-two forms were randomly selected and analysed (30%).

Location of complaint

Ten forms did not state where the complainant was located:

Not stated	10
Fowler	3
Ellis	2
Dixon	2
Brister	3
Lakes	2
Admin	1
Annexe	1
Chapel	1
CSU	1
Education	1
Catering department	1
Visits	1
Gardens	1
External (parent)	1
Grounds	1

Nature of complaint

16 forms were from prisoners (50%):

- 11 - unfair treatment (69%)
- three - direct racist comments (19%)

15 forms were from staff (47%):

- six - racist comments by prisoners (40%)

One - raised by an external person

Nature of offence	Number	Reason for complaint
Prisoner against system	10	Unfair treatment – eight complaints Food – one complaint Locked up during day off – one complaint
White prisoner against system	2	Both complaints were about not being placed on Annexe due to ethnicity, and that black and minority ethnic prisoners were placed

		on unit due to ethnicity and not behaviour.
Staff against system	1	Chaplain regarding loss of pay when attending religious services
Staff against graffiti	1	Graffiti found in grounds
External parent against system	1	Unfair treatment to son in prison
Officer on behalf of prisoner	2	White prisoner making racist comments – one Black and minority ethnic prisoner making racist comment – one
Officer on behalf of staff	1	Catering staff making inappropriate comment to prisoners and other staff
Officer in defence following racist accusation by prisoner	3	All three - prisoners said officer was unfairly treating prisoner based on ethnicity.
Prisoner against staff	4	Verbal racism – three complaints Unfair treatment by wing staff – one complaint
Staff against prisoner	4	Prisoner making racist comment – three Prisoner unwilling to share cell – one
Staff against staff	2	Staff making inappropriate comments – one Diversity manager unfair treatment - one
Staff against white prisoner	1	Inappropriate comment to black and minority ethnic prisoners

Authorisation

All forms were signed by the governor of the establishment – none appeared to have been sent to the area manager.

The race equality officer was informed in all but one of the forms. The nature of this complaint appeared to be general (the individual not allowed out of cell when off work), and the reason for this was explained as long roll-check.

Two forms were raised alongside a security information report:

- one on a prisoner who refused to wear prison kit in case they were made by a black and minority ethnic person
- one due to inappropriate language used in the Annexe.

Outcomes

20 forms were dealt with appropriately (63%):

- of the 15 forms raised by staff, 11 (73%) were dealt with appropriately
- of the 16 forms raised by prisoners, nine (56%) were dealt with appropriately

In only 10 forms were complainants interviewed during investigations.

In only seven forms were witnesses called for interview. In one case, it was clear that staff were interviewed but prisoners were not, although prisoner witnesses were available.

In 24 (75%) of the forms complainants were given a written letter following completion of investigations.

Length of time from complaint to closure

On average it took 13 days from the submission of the complaint form to completion of the investigation by the race equality officer (two forms were not dated by the complainant and were not included in this analysis).

On average it took 17 days from the submission of the complaint to closure by the governor.

Case details

	Dealt with appropriately	
Prisoner against system	6 of 10	<p>None of the complaints were upheld</p> <p>One form stated that a 'simple' investigation had taken place, but there was no evidence in the file to suggest that this had taken place.</p> <p>One form had a complaint about D category status and wing staff behaviour. Although the D category status was explained, the other complaints about wing staff through the complaints procedure were not investigated and were not mentioned in the summary.</p> <p>No information was provided to prisoners in two cases.</p>
White prisoner against system	1 of the 2	One prisoner was informed that the system to transfer on to Annexe was on an individual basis and not on ethnicity. The other was not contacted again following his complaint.
Prisoner against staff	2 (2 were withdrawn)	Two of the complaints were withdrawn from prisoners following an approach from the race equality officer. One of the complaints was requested to be investigated further by the governor – due to the nature of language from prisoner in initial complaint. Of note, officers were interviewed but not prisoners.
External parent against system	No	Prisoner was transferred to another prison and results of investigation not passed on to prisoner or external parent.
Staff against system	Yes	A planned amendment to change this practice was written in form – but there was no evidence that this had taken place.
Staff against graffiti	Yes	Graffiti was removed and monitoring was to take place
Officer on behalf of prisoner	1 of the 2	No prisoners were approached about racist comments, even though in one case it was clear that named prisoners were involved, hence no prisoner was reprimanded for their behaviour. Both situations were to be monitored.
Officer on behalf of staff	No	Not clear from file that investigation was completed – as investigation report from race equality officer stated further work needed, but signed off by governor stating that not a racist issue. Staff would have needed to have been approached to refute claim that racist comment had not taken place, but only a prisoner was approached; no staff were challenged.
Officer in defence following racist accusation by prisoner	1 of the 3	<p>One of the cases did not appear completed – it stated that adjudication was still pending due to legal advice and officer sickness. However the form was signed off as though completed.</p> <p>Another case – prisoner was not interviewed, and the stance of the staff at interview was taken and 'not upheld'.</p>

<p>Staff against prisoner</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>Three of the prisoners cell sharing risk assessment reviewed and increased.</p> <p>One form mentioned a potential white gang, but no further investigation into this.</p> <p>One form had an adjudication pending – although the form was signed off as completed.</p>
<p>Staff against staff</p>	<p>1 of the 2</p>	<p>One complaint contained a letter sent to the accused (diversity manager) but nothing was sent to the complainant (visiting manager). Case not upheld. Interestingly, Governor signed off form although original complaint to diversity manager was about him.</p> <p>Other case – the officer was approached and said behaviour was appropriate; to attend diversity training.</p>
<p>Staff against white prisoner</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Prisoner approached and staff to monitor.</p>

Appendix IV: Time out of cell

Twenty-eight prisoners were approached to ascertain how many hours were spent out of cell a day. On each living unit (except Annexe) care was taken to speak to at least one prisoner who was:

- employed full-time
- employed part-time
- unemployed.

Prisoners on the Annexe unit were excluded as they were unlocked throughout the day and were all employed.

For this analysis, 26 interviews were analysed:

	Full-time	Part-time	Unemployed	Total
Brister	2	1	2	5
Ellis	2	1	2	5
Fowler	2	1	1	4
Lakes	2	1	1	4
Dixon	1	1	1	3
Howard	2	2	1	5
Total	11	7	8	26

Average time spent out of cell - wing

Average time spent out of cell for the establishment as a whole was calculated as 8 hours 35 minutes.

	Average time out of cell
Brister	8 hours 20 minutes
Ellis	8 hours 25 minutes
Fowler	9 hours 5 minutes
Lakes	9 hours 10 minutes
Dixon	9 hours
Howard	8 hours
All units	8 hours 35 minutes

Average time spent out of cell – employment

Average time out of cell for full-time workers was calculated as 10 hours 40 minutes - this ranged from 9hrs 45 minutes to 12 hours 15 minutes.

Average time out of cell for part-time workers was calculated as 8 hours 25 minutes - this ranged from 5 hours 45 minutes to 10 hours.

Average time out of cell for unemployed prisoners was calculated as 5 hours 55 minutes, this ranged from 4hrs to 8 hours 30 minutes.

	Average time out of cell
Full-time	10 hours 40 minutes
Part-time	8 hours 25 minutes
Unemployed	5 hours 55 minutes

Other information

Brister unit

Prisoners said that facilities were poor out of cell; that there was not much to do.

Fowler unit

Outside exercise took place in the evenings from 6.15-8pm. However, prisoners were uncertain about what was going to happen during the winter as they were now called inside earlier as it was beginning to get darker earlier.

One prisoner said that officers counted walking back from workshops as outside exercise if prisoners said they had not been allocated time outside.

Prisoners mentioned that it was very difficult to get on courses.

Ellis unit

Outside exercise was provided twice a week – on Wednesday and Thursdays or Tuesday and Thursdays.

Two prisoners said that evening exercise was often cancelled due to staff shortages.

Prisoners said there were insufficient activities for prisoners when on wing.

Staff did not encourage prisoners to engage in activities out of cell.

Lakes unit

Outside exercise took place on Tuesday/Thursday/Friday evenings.

Dixon unit

Prisoners complained that there was little activity on the units.

Outside exercise took place on Tuesday and Friday for an hour.

Howard unit

Exercise took place on Tuesday and Friday evening.

Unemployed prisoners were let out from 11am-12 on some days.

Prisoners mentioned some 'regime creep' as they were often locked up earlier than the times indicated on their units.

Appendix V: Wing file analysis

Twenty- eight files were randomly selected from across all wings. Four files were analysed from Brister, Fowler, Howard, Dixon, Ellis and Lakes wings. Two files were analysed from the Annexe and two files from the care and separation unit (CSU).

Frequency of entries

	Average number of days since <u>last</u> entry in file	Average number of entries per month	Average number of management checks per month
Brister	7.25	5.26	0.16
Fowler	2.5	4.5	0.13
Howard	2.25	7.8	0.16
Dixon	1.75	5.75	0.25
Ellis	4.75	4.67	0.5
Lakes	2.75	3.7	0.06
Annexe	2.5	3.9	0
CSU	0	142.5	0
Overall (CSU not included)	3.4	5.01	0.31

The analysis of wing history entries and a comparison across the wings indicated that the average number of entries from staff were around the expected one per week. The Lakes wing and the Annexe were slightly below the number of entries expected for a monthly period.

The average number of days since the last wing entry was calculated as 3.4. This indicated that wing history files were updated more often than the expected one entry per week. Only Brister indicated that, on average, staff did not make an entry every week, but this was only a minor difference.

Management checks

The analysis highlighted that entries by management were well below the expected number:

- in 16 of the 28 files (57%) there was no indication of any management check
- management checks were most frequent on Ellis - 12 checks over 24 months.
- Dixon wing also did comparatively better than the other wings, but this result was skewed by the recording of two management checks within two days after the inspection was announced.

Positive, negative and neutral comments

We analysed the entries as positive, negative or neutral. Positive or negative comments had to contain specific details about the prisoner and give clear reasons why the comment was positive or negative. Neutral comments included any purely functional entries, such as 'IEP

board held' or 'had a meeting with probation', and also included non-judgemental descriptive comments, such as 'has been a quiet week', 'no major issues' or 'this prisoner keeps himself to himself'. The assessment of whether an entry was 'positive', 'negative' or 'neutral' was subjective, and the data should be set in this context.

A total of 589 comments were made in the wing files analysed, and 114 comments in the CSU wing history files. The majority of comments were neutral.

	Positive	Negative	Neutral
Brister	16	0	84
Fowler	12	1	95
Howard	6	0	42
Dixon	9	2	104
Ellis	5	0	107
Lakes	1	1	60
Annexe	12	1	31
CSU	14	0	100
Overall (CSU not included)	61	5	523

Further analysis

Bullying

There were two comments relating to bullying:

- A wing file from the Annexe had a comment describing how allegations were made against a prisoner for 'pushing his weight around'. Other prisoners also claimed that this prisoner had made complaints against them, which resulted in threats to this prisoner. Staff commented that allegations from either party had no evidence.
- A prisoner on Dixon had some food stolen from his cell and retaliated by stealing from other prisoners. This started a serious assault and resulted in another prisoner being placed on report.

Two other bullying comments were found in cell sharing risk assessment reviews:

- A prisoner on Dixon assaulted another and was suspected of bullying; his risk assessment was increased to medium, although this was not recorded on the wing history file.
- Another prisoner was involved in various assaults against prisoners and accused of making racist comments, which raised security information reports. Again, there was no mention of this on the wing history file.

Cell sharing assessments

All except one wing history file included a cell sharing assessment. Two prisoners in the files sampled shared a cell and had been assessed as low risk. One prisoner from Howard wing was rated as low risk although he had stated on his assessment that he would not share with a homosexual.

Personal officers

The majority of wing files held no indication of the prisoner's personal officer (PO).

- One file on Brister wing included only one comment by the PO that they had introduced themselves to the prisoner.
- All files on Dixon wing made it clear who the PO was, with their name on the front of the folder. Of these four files, one had many general comments, including incentives and earned privileges, inter-prison visits and applications. A further two files included the date of introduction and general observational comments. The fourth file lacked any detailed comments.
- Other wing files from different units did not make it clear who the PO was and no comments were recorded.

Other comments

The majority of files had an induction passport in which the first section on personal information was filled out by reception staff on the first night. However, the section to be completed by the prisoner as he received induction on different areas of the prison was rarely completed.

Only two out of 28 files mentioned sentence planning or targets:

- one wing file from Ellis had a lifer management sentence plan
- one wing file from Lakes had a note stating when the OASys had been completed. A copy of this was in his file.

One wing file from the Annexe had 'Non-English speaking - speaks Spanish' on the front of the folder, although Dutch was cited as this prisoner's first language on his induction passport. Staff mentioned the use of interpreters and sign language, although no use of the telephone translation service was noted, and the induction did not advise the prisoner of the interpretation service. However, staff facilitated an inter-prison telephone call to this prisoner's wife once a month.

Incentives and earned privileges

We found a total of 31 IEP warnings in the 28 wing history files.

Wing	Number of files	Number of files with IEP warnings	Total IEP warnings
Brister	4	4	4
Fowler	4	2	3
Howard	4	1	1
Dixon	4	1	2
Ellis	4	4	14
Lakes	4	3	5
Annexe	2	0	0
CSU	2	1	2
Overall (CSU not included)	28	16	31

The most common reasons for receiving an IEP warning were:

- Nine (29%) - not attending work.
- Four (13%) - refusing or failing a mandatory drugs test.
- Two (6%) - threatening, disruptive or aggressive behaviour
- Two (6%) - possession of a mobile phone or SIM card.

Other reasons for administering an IEP warning included: playing computer games during education; smoking in non-smoking areas; late lock-ups; high stereo volume; leaving a television on; and following incorrect procedures when on sickness absence from work.

Case studies

Cases of note included a file from Lakes wing, which indicated that a prisoner was on enhanced level. After failing an MDT he was lowered to standard. The IEP review stated that, as an improvement objective, he should receive no adjudications for three months before applying for enhanced status. Yet, following a letter from the prisoner promising not to cause any more problems, his enhanced status was given back. Comment in wing file stated: 'Enhanced status given back by Governor White due to information given. Advised not to advertise the fact that he has this.'

An IEP review from a file in Ellis wing indicated that the prisoner was dropped to standard on 10.1.06 and reviewed back to enhanced on 9.3.06. The file then recorded numerous warnings for being impolite, high stereo volume, aggressive behaviour, possession of a mobile phone and being sacked from his job. Yet, there was no indication of a further IEP review, suggesting that the prisoner was still on enhanced status.

Other

A file from Brister wing also had a file from HMP Bedford, in which the dates of entries overlapped.

The wing files from the CSU were frequently updated, suggesting that prisoners were checked throughout the day. An initial segregation safety screen was completed. Staff commented that they offered in-cell education and work, a shower and a meal, but that both prisoners declined these. Both prisoners were seen regularly by the chaplain. Full wing history files were also held in the CSU and one mentioned that the prisoner was high risk generally and for cell sharing. He had a history of self-harm and was on medication.

Appendix VI: The use of force

In the six months before the inspection there had been 52 incidents of use of force. A random sample of 26 forms were analysed. Results are presented below:

Ethnicity

19 (73%) of the forms analysed involved incidents on prisoners from a black or minority ethnic background.

Location

The following table shows the location of the incident:

Ellis	Howard	CSU	Dixon	Visits	Lakes
8 (31%)	5 (19%)	5 (19%)	4 (15%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)

Following the incidents, six (23%) individuals were returned to their own cell. This included two already located in the CSU.

18 (69%) of the prisoners were relocated to the CSU.

Two of the prisoners already located in the CSU were moved to special accommodation following the incident.

Number of staff involved

The following table shows the number of staff involved in the incident:

1	2	3	4	5
1 (4%)	4 (15%)	10 (38%)	6 (23%)	5 (19%)

Planned/spontaneous incidents

10 (38%) were planned use of force incidents and 16 (62%) were spontaneous incidents.

Reasons for use of force:

- Two (8%) incidents involved use of force to prevent self-harm.
- One incident involved staff moving the prisoner to the CSU after he had smashed up his cell. Ratchet cuffs were used during the relocation, but no control and restraint (C&R). Although 'to prevent self-harm' was given as the reason for the use of force, this was not mentioned in any of the staff statements.
- One prisoner had possession of a blade and was threatening to cut himself. He was moved to a strip cell in the CSU and strip searched. He told staff that he had swallowed the blade and he had small cuts on his left forearm. There was no F213SH (report of self-harm injury) or details of whether his report of swallowing the blade was looked into or not.
- Nine (34%) incidents involved use of force to prevent injury to a third person.
- Eight of these incidents involved staff using restraint for their own safety.
- One incident involved the use of C&R to break up a fight between two prisoners.
- Six (23%) incidents involved prisoners refusing to be searched or attempting to conceal unauthorised articles. In one incident, a prisoner was seen taking an item

from a visitor. Following a search in the visits hall that found nothing, the prisoner was cuffed and taken to the CSU for a strip search, again nothing was found.

- Seven (27%) incidents involved relocating prisoners to the CSU following a previous incident or for adjudication. All these were planned uses of force.
- Two involved prisoners refusing to return to their cell:
- One prisoner refused to return to his cell in the CSU as he felt he should be able to return to normal location since he was appealing his adjudication. He became agitated and continued to refuse to return to his cell. On the F213 (report of injury) form there was a note for the community psychiatric nurse to look in on him.
- One prisoner refused to return to his cell and lay on the floor. When staff approached him he became aggressive and attempted to hit an officer.

Use of C&R and handcuffs

- 18 (69%) of incidents involved the use of C&R.
- 15 (58%) of incidents involved the use of ratchet handcuffs. Of these, eight (53%) were planned uses of handcuffs to move the prisoner to the CSU. The seven (47%) unplanned incidents with cuffs were also used to relocate them to the CSU.

Authorisation

23 (88%) of incidents were authorised. The following table breaks down the grade of the person authorising:

Senior officer	Principal officer	Officer	Night orderly officer	PSM 'E'
11 (48%)	8 (35%)	2 (9%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)

F213 forms

All forms had completed F213 forms. Of these, six (23%) mentioned some form of injury. These were all superficial injuries, such as slight bruising or a red mark, aside from the following:

- one prisoner told the medical officer that they had a broken arm and had injuries to their side. The form reported tender muscles and a note for the doctor to re-examine the prisoner.
- one prisoner had a bruised right arm and a nose bleed caused by being moved to the floor when officers could not apply locks as he was struggling. The F213 form stated superficial injuries.

F213SH

Only one form had a F213SH form, after a prisoner had made a ligature following his move to the CSU. Staff opened an ACCT self-harm monitoring form and the prisoner was moved to a safer cell.

Appendix VII: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Choosing the sample size

The baseline for the sample size was calculated using a robust statistical formula provided by a Home Office statistician. Essentially, the formula indicates the sample size that is required and the extent to which the findings from a sample of that size reflect the experiences of the whole population.

At the time of the survey on 13 September 2006, the prisoner population at HMP The Mount was 715. The baseline sample size was 126. Overall, this represented 18% of the prisoner population.

Selecting the sample

Respondents were randomly selected from a LIDS prisoner population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. This basically means every second person is selected from a LIDS list, which is printed in location order, if 50% of the population is to be sampled.

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

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. In total, one respondent was interviewed.

Methodology

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

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

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

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

Response rates

In total, 107 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 15% of the prison population. The response rate was 85%. In addition to the seven respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, eight questionnaires were not returned and four were returned blank.

Comparisons

The following document details the results from the survey. All missing responses are excluded from the analysis. All data from each establishment has been weighted, in order to mimic a consistent percentage sampled in each establishment.

Presented alongside the results from this survey are the comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in trainer prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 32 trainer prisons since April 2003.

In addition, three further comparative documents are attached. These show statistically significant differences between: the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group; those who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals; those who are Muslim versus non-Muslims.

In all the above documents, statistically significant differences are highlighted. Statistical significance merely indicates whether there is a real difference between the figures, i.e. the difference is not due to chance alone. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading, and where there is no significant difference, there is no shading.



Prisoner Survey Responses HMP The Mount 2006 Comparison to 2004 results

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

Key to tables

Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons comparator	HMP The Mount 2006	HMP The Mount 2004
Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons comparator		
Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		

SECTION 1: General Information (not tested for significance)

		HMP The Mount 2006	HMP The Mount 2004
1	Number of completed questionnaires returned	107	119
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	1	1
3	Are you transgender or transsexual?		
4	Are you sentenced?	100	97
5	Are you on recall?		
6	Is your sentence more than four years?	91	51
7	Do you have less than six months to serve?	15	32
8	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	5	9
9	Are you a foreign national?	31	23
10	Is English your first language?	79	85
11	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories)	56	49
12	Are you Muslim?		
13	Are you gay or bisexual?		
14	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?		
15	Are you a Registered Disabled Person?		
16	Have you been in prison more than five times?	7	23
17	Do you have any children?	65	60

SECTION 2: Transfers and Escorts

18a	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the cleanliness of the van? (very good/good)	47	48
18b	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was your personal safety during the journey? (very good/good)	60	59
18c	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the comfort of the van? (very good/good)	26	19
18d	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the attention paid to your health needs?	39	25
18e	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the frequency of comfort breaks? (very good/good)	23	13
19	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	8	10
20	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67	71
21a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another establishment?	84	89
21b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	22	20
21c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	78	85

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons comparator	HMP The Mount 2006	HMP The Mount 2004
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
23	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	63	73
23a	Did you have any problems with loss of transferred property when you first arrived?	20	10
23b	Did you have any housing problems when you first arrived?	17	19
23c	Did you have any problems contacting employers when you first arrived?	6	4
23d	Did you have any problems contacting family when you first arrived?	12	28
23e	Did you have any problems ensuring dependents were being looked after when you first arrived?	7	7
23f	Did you have any money worries when you first arrived?	21	24
23g	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal when you first arrived?	11	15
23h	Did you have any drug problems when you first arrived?	8	11
23i	Did you have any alcohol problems when you first arrived?	2	11
23j	Did you have any health problems when you first arrived?	14	16
23k	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners when you first arrived?	3	5
24a	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with loss of transferred property within the first 24 hours?		
24b	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with housing problems within the first 24 hours?		
24c	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with problems contacting employers within the first 24 hours?		
24d	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?		
24e	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with problems ensuring dependants were looked after within the first 24 hours?		
24f	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with money problems within the first 24 hours?		
24g	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?		
24h	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with drug problems within the first 24 hours?		
24i	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with alcohol problems within the first 24 hours?		
24j	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?		
24k	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with problems in needing protection from other prisoners within the first 24 hours?		
25a	Please answer the following question about reception: were you seen by a member of healthcare staff?	91	92
25b	Please answer the following question about reception: when you were searched, was this carried out in a sensitive and understanding way?	72	71
26	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	72	69
27a	Did you receive a reception pack on your day of arrival?	84	77
27b	Did you receive information about what was going to happen here on your day of arrival?	63	44
27c	Did you receive information about support for feeling depressed or suicidal on your day of arrival?	50	36
27d	Did you have the opportunity to have a shower on your day of arrival?	49	32
27e	Did you get the opportunity to have a free telephone call on your day of arrival?	41	19
27f	Did you get information about routine requests on your day of arrival?	38	28
27g	Did you get something to eat on your day of arrival?	76	77
27h	Did you get information about visits on your day of arrival?	58	38
28a	Did you have access to the chaplain/priest within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	63	64

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons comparator	HMP The Mount 2006	HMP The Mount 2004
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		

SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction (continued)

28b	Did you have access to someone from healthcare within the first 24 hours?	77	82
28c	Did you have access to a Listener/Samaritans within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	36	21
28d	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	32	21
29	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	84	71
30	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	82	70
31	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	66	45

SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody

33a	Is it very easy/easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?		
33b	Is it very easy/easy for you to attend legal visits?		
33c	Is it very easy/easy for you to obtain bail information?		
34	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	45	32
35a	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	49	62
35b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94	89
35c	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	74	75
35d	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	76	69
35e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	39	38
35f	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	64	54
35g	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	32	17
36	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	38	19
37	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	54	52
38a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	88	72
38b	It is easy/very easy to get an application form?	94	79
39a	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	51	44
39b	Do you feel your applications are sorted out promptly?	52	50
39c	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	21	47
39d	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly?	25	45
39e	Are you given information about how to make an appeal?	37	45
40	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	16	12
41	Do you know how to apply to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman?	40	37
42	Is it easy/very easy to contact the Independent Monitoring Board?	28	33
43	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	66	34

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons comparator	HMP The Mount 2006	HMP The Mount 2004
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		

SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody (continued)

44	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	42	37
45a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C & R)?	4	5
45b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	12	11
46a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	49	47
46b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	64	47
46	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	61	42
48a	Do you have a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	62	64
48b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	71	62

SECTION 5: Safety

50	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	35	42
51	Do you feel unsafe in this establishment at the moment?		
53	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	26	26
54a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By prisoners)	10	14
54b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By prisoners)	7	9
54c	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By prisoners)	1	1
54d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	12	10
54e	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By prisoners)	1	4
54f	Have you ever had your canteen/property taken since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3	6
54g	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By prisoners)	3	8
54h	Have you ever been victimised because of your sexuality? (By prisoners)		
54i	Have you ever been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)		
54j	Have you ever been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)		
54k	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (by prisoners)	9	8
55	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	28	20
56a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By staff)	9	11
56b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By staff)	2	4
56c	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By staff)	1	0
56d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	10	6
56e	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By staff)	2	2
56f	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By staff)	9	4
56g	Have you ever been victimised because of your sexuality? (By staff)		
56h	Have you ever been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)		
56i	Have you ever been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)		

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons comparator	HMP The Mount 2006	HMP The Mount 2004
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		
SECTION 5: Safety (continued)			
56j	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (By staff)	6	5
57	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	13	12
58	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/ group of prisoners in here?	28	
59	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	24	
60	Is it very easy/easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	31	44
SECTION 6: Healthcare			
62	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	47	39
63a	Is it very easy/easy to see the doctor?		
63b	Is it very easy/easy to see the nurse?		
63c	Is it very easy/easy to see the dentist?		
63d	Is it very easy/easy to see the optician?		
63e	Is it very easy/easy to see the pharmacist?		
64a	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the doctor is good/very good?	43	34
64b	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the nurse is good/very good?	62	59
64c	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dentist is good/very good?	28	22
64d	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the optician is good/very good?	27	22
64e	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dispensing staff/pharmacist is good/very good?	50	40
65	Are you currently taking medication?		
66	Are you allowed to keep possession of your medication in your own cell?		
SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity			
68a	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	48	26
68b	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	52	38
68c	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	64	44
68d	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	52	32
68e	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	46	42
69	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	42	52
70	Can you get access to a newspaper every day?	57	44
71	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	47	35
72	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	50	64
73	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	35	8
74	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	73	37
75	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	21	13

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons comparator	HMP The Mount 2006	HMP The Mount 2004
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		
SECTION 8: Resettlement			
77	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	34	18
78	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	42	31
79	Do you have a sentence plan?	68	38
80	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your sentence plan?	51	22
81	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	55	36
82	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	19	40
83	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	29	18
84	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	73	62
85	Did you receive five or more visits in the last week?		
86a	Do you think you will have a problem with finding a job following your release from this prison?		
86b	Do you think you will have a problem with finding accommodation following your release from this prison?		
86c	Do you think you will have a problem with money and finances following your release from this prison?		
86d	Do you think you will have a problem with claiming benefits following your release from this prison?		
86e	Do you think you will have a problem with arranging a place at collage or continuing education following your release from this prison?		
86f	Do you think you will have a problem with contacting external drug or alcohol agencies following your release from this prison?		
86g	Do you think you will have a problem with accessing healthcare services following your release from this prison?		
86h	Do you think you will have a problem with opening a bank account following your release from this prison?		
87a	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison?	3	6
87b	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison?	3	7
88a	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding a job on release?	69	39
88b	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding accommodation on release?	69	46
88c	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with your finances in preparation for release?	55	45
88d	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with claiming benefits on release?	60	50
88e	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	55	37
88f	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with external drugs courses etc	53	46
88g	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with continuity of healthcare on release?	54	36
88h	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with opening a bank account on release?		
89	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	76	61

Key Question Responses (Ethnicity) HMP The Mount 2006

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the responses from White prisoners		
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the responses from White prisoners		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the responses from black and minority ethnic prisoners and those from White prisoners		
	Number of completed questionnaires returned	58	46
12	Are you a Muslim? (Not tested for significance)	38	7
20	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71	62
21c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	76	82
26	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	63	84
29	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	81	89
30	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	82	86
33a	Is it very easy/easy for you to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	44	37
35b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day?	93	96
35e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	42	38
36	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	46	31
37	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	58	51
39c	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	13	28
43	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	55	80
44	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	36	51
45a	In the last 6 months have you been physically restrained?	6	2
45b	In the last 6 months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	14	9
48b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	65	79
50	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	44	21
51	Do you feel unsafe in this establishment at the moment?	17	9
53	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	29	20
54d	Have you been victimised by another prisoner because of your race or ethnic origin?	10	14

54j	Have you ever been victimised by another prisoner because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4	4
55	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	31	23
56d	Have you been victimised by a member of staff because of your race or ethnic origin?	14	7
56i	Have you every been victimised by a member of staff because of your religion/religious beliefs?	12	7
62	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	43	52
68a	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	48	46
68b	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	64	39
68c	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	74	51
68d	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	65	40
68e	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	49	46
69	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	48	36
71	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	42	55
72	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	50	52
73	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	23	50
74	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	71	80
77	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	33	34
78	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	39	46
82	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	19	19
84	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	72	77
89	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	80	70



Key Question Responses (Nationality) HMP The Mount 2006

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

Key to tables

		Foreign Nationals	British Nationals
	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the responses from British Nationals		
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the responses from British Nationals		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the responses from British Nationals and those from Foreign Nationals		
	Number of completed questionnaires returned	32	72
12	Are you Muslim? (Not tested for significance)	32	20
20	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	47	74
21c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	68	81
26	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	65	75
29	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	84	85
30	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	86	83
33a	Is it very easy/easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	35	42
35b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day?	86	97
35e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	33	41
36	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	40	37
37	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	48	58
39c	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	17	22
43	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	79	61
44	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	48	39
45a	In the last 6 months have you been physically restrained?	4	4
45b	In the last 6 months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	10	13
48b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	62	75
50	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	40	32
51	do you feel unsafe in this establishment at the moment?	10	15
53	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	29	25
55	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	32	25
62	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	47	47
68a	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	56	43
68b	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	46	54
68c	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	74	59
68d	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	36	57
68e	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	46	47
69	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	55	37
71	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	47	49
72	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	71	43
73	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	39	35
74	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	68	77
77	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	28	37
78	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	28	47
82	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	24	16
84	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	75	74
89	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	78	75



Prisoner Survey Responses HMP The Mount 2006

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

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the non- Muslim comparator	Muslim	Non- Muslim
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the non- Muslim comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		

SECTION 1: General Information (not tested for significance)

1	Number of completed questionnaires returned	22	73
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	5	0
3	Are you transgender or transsexual?	0	0
4	Are you sentenced?	100	100
5	Are you on recall?	90	91
6	Is your sentence more than four years?	80	93
7	Do you have less than six months to serve?	17	14
8	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	15	3
9	Are you a foreign national?	41	27
10	Is English your first language?	68	81
11	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories)	86	44
12	Are you Muslim?		
13	Are you gay or bisexual?	0	3
14	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	17	14
15	Are you a Registered Disabled Person?	6	2
16	Have you been in prison more than five times?	6	8
17	Do you have any children?	47	72

SECTION 2: Transfers and Escorts

18a	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the cleanliness of the van? (very good/good)	37	52
18b	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was your personal safety during the journey? (very good/good)	69	62
18c	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the comfort of the van? (very good/good)	21	29
18d	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the attention paid to your health needs?	26	45
18e	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the frequency of comfort breaks? (very good/good)	6	30
19	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	16	6
20	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	58	72
21a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another establishment?	76	90
21b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	40	17
21c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	70	82

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the non- Muslim comparator	Muslim	Non- Muslim
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the non- Muslim comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
23	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	76	61
23a	Did you have any problems with loss of transferred property when you first arrived?	14	20
23b	Did you have any housing problems when you first arrived?	24	14
23c	Did you have any problems contacting employers when you first arrived?	0	6
23d	Did you have any problems contacting family when you first arrived?	9	11
23e	Did you have any problems ensuring dependents were being looked after when you first arrived?	9	5
23f	Did you have any money worries when you first arrived?	14	20
23g	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal when you first arrived?	5	12
23h	Did you have any drug problems when you first arrived?	9	8
23i	Did you have any alcohol problems when you first arrived?	5	0
23j	Did you have any health problems when you first arrived?	14	14
23k	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners when you first arrived?	5	3
24a	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with loss of transferred property within the first 24 hours?	10	19
24b	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with housing problems within the first 24 hours?	10	15
24c	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with problems contacting employers within the first 24 hours?	0	14
24d	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?	57	51
24e	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with problems ensuring dependants were looked after within the first 24 hours?	15	17
24f	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with money problems within the first 24 hours?	12	29
24g	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?	55	36
24h	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with drug problems within the first 24 hours?	27	33
24i	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with alcohol problems within the first 24 hours?	20	25
24j	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?	50	50
24k	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with problems in needing protection from other prisoners within the first 24 hours?	20	20
25a	Please answer the following question about reception: were you seen by a member of healthcare staff?	86	93
25b	Please answer the following question about reception: when you were searched, was this carried out in a sensitive and understanding way?	60	75
26	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	62	78
27a	Did you receive a reception pack on your day of arrival?	74	88
27b	Did you receive information about what was going to happen here on your day of arrival?	47	68
27c	Did you receive information about support for feeling depressed or suicidal on your day of arrival?	42	53
27d	Did you have the opportunity to have a shower on your day of arrival?	37	51
27e	Did you get the opportunity to have a free telephone call on your day of arrival?	47	40
27f	Did you get information about routine requests on your day of arrival?	37	39
27g	Did you get something to eat on your day of arrival?	69	79
27h	Did you get information about visits on your day of arrival?	58	61
28a	Did you have access to the chaplain/priest within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	55	67

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the non- Muslim comparator	Muslim	Non- Muslim
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the non- Muslim comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction (continued)			
28b	Did you have access to someone from healthcare within the first 24 hours?	65	80
28c	Did you have access to a Listener/Samaritans within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	40	34
28d	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	15	36
29	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	86	89
30	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	81	83
31	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	57	69
SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody			
33a	Is it very easy/easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	45	39
33b	Is it very easy/easy for you to attend legal visits?	47	51
33c	Is it very easy/easy for you to obtain bail information?	22	21
34	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	52	39
35a	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	58	46
35b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100	96
35c	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	90	71
35d	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	94	75
35e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	37	41
35f	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	53	67
35g	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	16	39
36	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	25	45
37	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	47	58
38a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	90	89
38b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	100	93
39a	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	47	56
39b	Do you feel your applications are sorted out promptly?	50	56
39c	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	10	27
39d	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly?	15	31
39e	Are you given information about how to make an appeal?	21	46
40	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	10	17
41	Do you know how to apply to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman?	32	45
42	Is it easy/very easy to contact the Independent Monitoring Board?	26	30
43	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	60	65

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the non- Muslim comparator	Muslim	Non- Muslim
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the non- Muslim comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		

SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody (continued)			
44	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	37	44
45a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C & R)?	10	0
45b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	10	10
46a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50	49
46b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	85	60
46	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	74	59
48a	Do you have a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	67	62
48b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	78	70
SECTION 5: Safety			
50	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	50	31
51	Do you feel unsafe in this establishment at the moment?	22	11
53	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	22	26
54a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By prisoners)	11	10
54b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By prisoners)	6	6
54c	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	0
54d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	11	12
54e	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	0
54f	Have you ever had your canteen/property taken since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	3
54g	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By prisoners)	6	2
54h	Have you ever been victimised because of your sexuality? (By prisoners)	0	3
54i	Have you ever been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	6	2
54j	Have you ever been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	6	3
54k	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (by prisoners)	6	10
55	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	44	20
56a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By staff)	17	3
56b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By staff)	6	2
56c	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By staff)	0	2
56d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	11	9
56e	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By staff)	0	3
56f	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By staff)	17	7
56g	Have you ever been victimised because of your sexuality? (By staff)	0	0
56h	Have you ever been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0	2
56i	Have you ever been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	22	6

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the non- Muslim comparator	Muslim	Non- Muslim
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the non- Muslim comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		

SECTION 5: Safety (continued)			
56j	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (By staff)	6	6
57	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	25	9
58	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/ group of prisoners in here?	35	27
59	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	29	19
60	Is it very easy/easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	28	36
SECTION 6: Healthcare			
62	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	40	46
63a	Is it very easy/easy to see the doctor?	33	60
63b	Is it very easy/easy to see the nurse?	44	74
63c	Is it very easy/easy to see the dentist?	6	18
63d	Is it very easy/easy to see the optician?	24	29
63e	Is it very easy/easy to see the pharmacist?	29	50
64a	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the doctor is good/very good?	32	45
64b	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the nurse is good/very good?	42	67
64c	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dentist is good/very good?	32	28
64d	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the optician is good/very good?	21	28
64e	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dispensing staff/pharmacist is good/very good?	33	53
65	Are you currently taking medication?	32	30
66	Are you allowed to keep possession of your medication in your own cell?	26	30
SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity			
68a	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	33	54
68b	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	65	50
68c	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	63	67
68d	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	71	48
68e	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	50	45
69	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	47	40
70	Can you get access to a newspaper every day?	55	59
71	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	60	44
72	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	50	51
73	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	20	42
74	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	69	77
75	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	25	19

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the non- Muslim comparator	Muslim	Non- Muslim
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the non- Muslim comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		

SECTION 8: Resettlement

		Muslim	Non- Muslim
77	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	35	33
78	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	47	41
79	Do you have a sentence plan?	69	70
80	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your sentence plan?	58	48
81	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	60	54
82	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	20	19
83	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	16	29
84	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	75	71
85	Did you receive five or more visits in the last week?	0	3
86a	Do you think you will have a problem with finding a job following your release from this prison?	41	30
86b	Do you think you will have a problem with finding accommodation following your release from this prison?	29	42
86c	Do you think you will have a problem with money and finances following your release from this prison?	44	48
86d	Do you think you will have a problem with claiming benefits following your release from this prison?	31	36
86e	Do you think you will have a problem with arranging a place at collage or continuing education following your release from this prison?	22	31
86f	Do you think you will have a problem with contacting external drug or alcohol agencies following your release from this prison?	16	8
86g	Do you think you will have a problem with accessing healthcare services following your release from this prison?	9	15
86h	Do you think you will have a problem with opening a bank account following your release from this prison?	15	45
87a	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison?	0	3
87b	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison?	6	2
88a	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding a job on release?	73	69
88b	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding accommodation on release?	69	69
88c	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with your finances in preparation for release?	39	57
88d	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with claiming benefits on release?	50	63
88e	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	50	59
88f	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with external drugs courses etc	38	57
88g	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with continuity of healthcare on release?	43	55
88h	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with opening a bank account on release?	36	48
89	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	79	75



Prisoner Survey Responses HMP The Mount 2006

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

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons comparator	HMP The Mount	Trainer Prisons Comparator
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		

SECTION 1: General Information (not tested for significance)

1	Number of completed questionnaires returned	107	2916
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	1	0
3	Are you transgender or transsexual?	1	
4	Are you sentenced?	100	100
5	Are you on recall?	8	
6	Is your sentence more than four years?	91	63
7	Do you have less than six months to serve?	15	27
8	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	5	6
9	Are you a foreign national?	31	11
10	Is English your first language?	79	91
11	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories)	56	24
12	Are you Muslim?	23	
13	Are you gay or bisexual?	3	
14	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	16	
15	Are you a Registered Disabled Person?	3	
16	Have you been in prison more than five times?	7	25
17	Do you have any children?	65	58

SECTION 2: Transfers and Escorts

18a	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the cleanliness of the van? (very good/good)	47	49
18b	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was your personal safety during the journey? (very good/good)	60	62
18c	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the comfort of the van? (very good/good)	26	17
18d	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the attention paid to your health needs?	39	33
18e	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the frequency of comfort breaks? (very good/good)	23	13
19	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	8	12
20	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67	70
21a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another establishment?	84	87
21b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	22	17
21c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	78	89

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons comparator	HMP The Mount	Trainer Prisons Comparator
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		

SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction

23	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	63	53
23a	Did you have any problems with loss of transferred property when you first arrived?	20	13
23b	Did you have any housing problems when you first arrived?	17	11
23c	Did you have any problems contacting employers when you first arrived?	6	3
23d	Did you have any problems contacting family when you first arrived?	12	18
23e	Did you have any problems ensuring dependents were being looked after when you first arrived?	7	4
23f	Did you have any money worries when you first arrived?	21	16
23g	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal when you first arrived?	11	12
23h	Did you have any drug problems when you first arrived?	8	10
23i	Did you have any alcohol problems when you first arrived?	2	4
23j	Did you have any health problems when you first arrived?	14	15
23k	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners when you first arrived?	3	4
24a	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with loss of transferred property within the first 24 hours?	17	
24b	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with housing problems within the first 24 hours?	14	
24c	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with problems contacting employers within the first 24 hours?	10	
24d	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?	52	
24e	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with problems ensuring dependants were looked after within the first 24 hours?	15	
24f	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with money problems within the first 24 hours?	26	
24g	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?	41	
24h	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with drug problems within the first 24 hours?	31	
24i	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with alcohol problems within the first 24 hours?	24	
24j	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?	50	
24k	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with problems in needing protection from other prisoners within the first 24 hours?	19	
25a	Please answer the following question about reception: were you seen by a member of healthcare staff?	91	87
25b	Please answer the following question about reception: when you were searched, was this carried out in a sensitive and understanding way?	72	74
26	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	72	73
27a	Did you receive a reception pack on your day of arrival?	84	70
27b	Did you receive information about what was going to happen here on your day of arrival?	63	49
27c	Did you receive information about support for feeling depressed or suicidal on your day of arrival?	50	42
27d	Did you have the opportunity to have a shower on your day of arrival?	49	47
27e	Did you get the opportunity to have a free telephone call on your day of arrival?	41	47
27f	Did you get information about routine requests on your day of arrival?	38	38
27g	Did you get something to eat on your day of arrival?	76	77
27h	Did you get information about visits on your day of arrival?	58	45
28a	Did you have access to the chaplain/priest within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	63	47

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons comparator	HMP The Mount	Trainer Prisons Comparator
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction (continued)			
28b	Did you have access to someone from healthcare within the first 24 hours?	77	72
28c	Did you have access to a Listener/Samaritans within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	36	34
28d	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	32	28
29	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	84	86
30	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	82	66
31	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	66	59
SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody			
33a	Is it very easy/easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	40	
33b	Is it very easy/easy for you to attend legal visits?	50	
33c	Is it very easy/easy for you to obtain bail information?	19	
34	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	45	39
35a	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	49	66
35b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94	92
35c	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	74	86
35d	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	76	77
35e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	39	47
35f	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	64	73
35g	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	32	37
36	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	38	39
37	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	54	45
38a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	88	86
38b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	94	91
39a	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	51	31
39b	Do you feel your applications are sorted out promptly?	52	35
39c	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	21	37
39d	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly?	25	37
39e	Are you given information about how to make an appeal?	37	33
40	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	16	14
41	Do you know how to apply to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman?	40	51
42	Is it easy/very easy to contact the Independent Monitoring Board?	28	46
43	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	66	57

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons comparator	HMP The Mount	Trainer Prisons Comparator
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		

SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody (continued)

44	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	42	56
45a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C & R)?	4	5
45b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	12	14
46a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	49	57
46b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	64	64
46	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	61	66
48a	Do you have a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	62	74
48b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	71	62

SECTION 5: Safety

50	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	35	26
51	Do you feel unsafe in this establishment at the moment?	14	
53	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	26	19
54a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By prisoners)	10	11
54b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By prisoners)	7	5
54c	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By prisoners)	1	1
54d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	12	3
54e	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By prisoners)	1	2
54f	Have you ever had your canteen/property taken since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3	3
54g	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By prisoners)	3	3
54h	Have you ever been victimised because of your sexuality? (By prisoners)	3	
54i	Have you ever been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	3	
54j	Have you ever been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	4	
54k	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (by prisoners)	9	4
55	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	28	20
56a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By staff)	9	10
56b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By staff)	2	2
56c	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By staff)	1	0
56d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	10	4
56e	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By staff)	2	2
56f	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By staff)	9	3
56g	Have you ever been victimised because of your sexuality? (By staff)	0	
56h	Have you ever been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	1	
56i	Have you ever been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	9	

Key to tables

Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons comparator	HMP The Mount	Trainer Prisons Comparator
Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons comparator		
Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		

SECTION 5: Safety (continued)

56j	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (By staff)	6	3
57	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	13	10
58	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/ group of prisoners in here?	28	22
59	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	24	17
60	Is it very easy/easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	31	26

SECTION 6: Healthcare

62	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	47	44
63a	Is it very easy/easy to see the doctor?	53	
63b	Is it very easy/easy to see the nurse?	65	
63c	Is it very easy/easy to see the dentist?	14	
63d	Is it very easy/easy to see the optician?	27	
63e	Is it very easy/easy to see the pharmacist?	46	
64a	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the doctor is good/very good?	43	43
64b	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the nurse is good/very good?	62	59
64c	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dentist is good/very good?	28	33
64d	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the optician is good/very good?	27	26
64e	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dispensing staff/pharmacist is good/very good?	50	46
65	Are you currently taking medication?	32	
66	Are you allowed to keep possession of your medication in your own cell?	31	

SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity

68a	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	48	36
68b	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	52	41
68c	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	64	53
68d	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	52	41
68e	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	46	35
69	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	42	50
70	Can you get access to a newspaper every day?	57	62
71	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	47	56
72	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	50	46
73	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	35	21
74	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	73	76
75	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	21	22

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons comparator	HMP The Mount	Trainer Prisons Comparator
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2006 survey and the trainer prisons comparator		

SECTION 8: Resettlement

77	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	34	34
78	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	42	49
79	Do you have a sentence plan?	68	67
80	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your sentence plan?	51	46
81	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	55	31
82	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	19	20
83	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	29	27
84	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	73	73
85	Did you receive five or more visits in the last week?	2	
86a	Do you think you will have a problem with finding a job following your release from this prison?	33	
86b	Do you think you will have a problem with finding accommodation following your release from this prison?	39	
86c	Do you think you will have a problem with money and finances following your release from this prison?	46	
86d	Do you think you will have a problem with claiming benefits following your release from this prison?	35	
86e	Do you think you will have a problem with arranging a place at college or continuing education following your release from this prison?	32	
86f	Do you think you will have a problem with contacting external drug or alcohol agencies following your release from this prison?	13	
86g	Do you think you will have a problem with accessing healthcare services following your release from this prison?	14	
86h	Do you think you will have a problem with opening a bank account following your release from this prison?	39	
87a	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison?	3	9
87b	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison?	3	6
88a	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding a job on release?	69	49
88b	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding accommodation on release?	69	50
88c	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with your finances in preparation for release?	55	37
88d	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with claiming benefits on release?	60	48
88e	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	55	39
88f	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with external drugs courses etc	53	46
88g	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with continuity of healthcare on release?	54	43
88h	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with opening a bank account on release?	48	
89	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	76	60