



Criminal Justice Inspection  
Northern Ireland  
*a better justice system for all*



Report on an unannounced inspection of

# Magilligan Prison

---

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons and the  
Chief Inspector of Criminal Justice in  
Northern Ireland

10 – 19 May 2006

Report on an unannounced follow-up  
inspection of

# **Magilligan Prison**

10 – 19 May 2006

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons and the Chief Inspector  
of Criminal Justice in Northern Ireland

Crown copyright 2006

ISBN 13: 978-1-84726-126-7

ISBN 10: 1-84726-126-4

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

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	5
<b>Fact page</b>	7
<b>1 Healthy prison summary and progress on main recommendations</b>	9
<b>2 Progress on other recommendations</b>	
<hr/>	
1 Arrival in custody	23
2 Environment and relationships	27
3 Duty of care	31
4 Healthcare	41
5 Activities	45
6 Good order	51
7 Services	59
8 Resettlement	63
9 Management of human resources	71
<b>3 Summary of recommendations</b>	77
<b>Appendices</b>	
<hr/>	
I Inspection team	i
II Prison population profile	ii
III Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	vi



# Introduction

Our last inspection of Magilligan, in 2004, took place at a very difficult time for the prison and the Northern Ireland Prison Service. Industrial relations were poor, and directly affected outcomes for prisoners. As a result, some of the promising developments we had recorded in our 2001 inspection had failed to progress, and some aspects of prison life, particularly the regime, had slipped back.

We therefore returned on a full unannounced follow-up inspection, in order to reassess the prison against our four tests of safety, respect, purposeful activity and resettlement. We found that some progress had been made in all areas; but that two factors – a very poor built environment and the limited role of residential staff – still prevented Magilligan from performing as well as it could and should.

Resettlement remained a strength: most prisoners had resettlement plans, and there were very good family liaison provisions. Many local agencies were involved in service provision, including some extremely supportive substance use work. However, the benefits of this were diminished because this work was still not embedded in the prison as a whole, and prisoners were often unsure how, and by what means, to access these services.

Activities had improved, particularly the quality and quantity of education. But there was still too little meaningful work for a training prison: 80 prisoners were unemployed, and too many of the others were engaged in relatively unproductive and unskilled domestic jobs. There were plans to improve this, but accommodation and facilities for workshops and the library were poor. Though the regime was much more consistently delivered than at the time of the last inspection, movement to activities was slow and unnecessarily restricted the time spent in purposeful activity. This reflected an over-emphasis on physical and procedural security, which was inappropriate for the population held.

At the last inspection, we recommended the demolition of the H-blocks and their replacement by modern, purpose-built units. This had not happened, and it needs to. The units were unsafe and unsanitary; moreover, they inhibited proper engagement between staff and prisoners, leaving too many staff literally as turnkeys. The whole Magilligan site, with its collection of Nissen huts and random, often unsuitable, buildings, needs to be redeveloped if the prison is to remain there.

Staff-prisoner relationships, on the H-blocks in particular, remained distant. Good work was taking place in the specialist units, but elsewhere there was virtually no personal officer work and little prisoner confidence in the complaints system. Relationships were essentially reactive. Three-quarters of prisoners reported respectful treatment from most staff, but fewer prisoners than in 2004 said that there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem. The segregation unit caused particular concern: the building was unfit for purpose, the regime basic and the culture over-punitive. Magilligan needed a new unit, with a clear purpose, and a specifically selected staff group.

In our previous report, we recommended that the Northern Ireland Prison Service should monitor outcomes for prisoners by religion, as well as ethnicity. This had been done, in relation to certain areas, and showed differential outcomes in relation to the incentives scheme, disciplinary charges and access to the resettlement unit. Our own survey indicated other areas where prisoners who self-identified as Irish perceived that they had poorer treatment by staff and less help with resettlement or skills. These findings are of serious concern, though they do not necessarily point to direct discrimination. It is important for the Northern Ireland Prison Service to ensure that all areas of prison life are monitored, to carry

out research to establish the reasons for any differential outcomes and perceptions and to support managers and staff to take any appropriate and necessary action.

It was also disturbing that more prisoners than in 2004 reported feeling unsafe; and this figure was twice as high as we normally find in training prisons. These perceptions were particularly strong among vulnerable prisoners, who were not always held separately from the main population. Two-thirds of them said they had felt unsafe, and they were two or three times more likely than other prisoners to report victimisation by another prisoner. In general, bullying was not well identified, or dealt with, and the anti-bullying strategy needed strengthening, as part of a comprehensive violence reduction strategy. It was, however, encouraging that procedures for receiving and inducting new prisoners had improved, and were generally good; and levels of self-harm were low.

Overall, this is a report on a prison making progress, after a difficult period, and against the backdrop of inadequate and unsuitable facilities. Changing the built environment is key to unlocking the potential of the prison and its staff. There is progressive work at Magilligan, but it is noticeable that it is taking place outside the H-blocks and often without sufficient involvement by residential staff. The task for prison managers and for the Northern Ireland Prison Service is to ensure that the whole prison is directed towards its training and resettlement role.

**Anne Owers**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**August 2006**

**Kit Chivers**  
Chief Inspector of Criminal Justice in Northern Ireland

# Fact page

## Task of the establishment

Magilligan is a medium-risk prison holding adult male prisoners with six years or less to serve. It has separate low security accommodation for selected prisoners nearing the end of their sentence.

## Area organisation

Northern Ireland

## Number held

397 (11 May 2006)

## Certified normal accommodation

452

## Operational capacity

462

## Last full inspection

20-24 September 2004

## Brief history

The prison is located at Magilligan Point, Co Londonderry, close to Lough Foyle. It was opened in May 1972 as a 'compound prison'. The Nissen huts and compounds were replaced in the early 1980s. In 1994 Foyleview was commissioned as a semi-open facility. Sperrin, a 64-bed unit with dormitory accommodation, was recommissioned in 2005, having originally been used as a residential unit while the H-blocks were, in turn, being refurbished.

## Description of residential units

H1	100 low and medium security prisoners, H1AB drug-free unit
H2	100 low and medium security prisoners, H2CD vulnerable prisoner unit
H3	100 low and medium security prisoners, H3CD induction unit
Sperrin	64 low security prisoners, CD vulnerable prisoner unit
Foyleview	82 prisoners nearing the end of sentence



# Healthy prison summary

## Introduction

---

HP1 The purpose of this inspection was to follow up the recommendations made in our last full announced inspection, in September 2004, and establish what progress had been made against the recommendations we made at that time. As well as examining the progress on recommendations, we have made an assessment of the outcomes for prisoners against each of our healthy prison tests, and therefore the prison's overall performance against the test. The criteria for these tests 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 have made 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, and which need to be addressed by others in the Northern Ireland Prison Service and elsewhere within the wider criminal justice sector.

**...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 and 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 In addition to observation and meetings with managers and other staff, we were aided in our assessments by a prisoner survey conducted at the beginning of the inspection, and by prisoner focus groups.

HP4 Only two of the 11 recommendations from the previous report had been fully achieved, although four had been achieved in part. Reasonable progress had been made in implementing the general recommendations: 38% had been achieved and 21% partially achieved, with 41% not achieved.

## Safety

---

HP5 Prisoners felt unsafe in vans to Magilligan. Reception was clean and efficient but free telephone calls were not provided. First night procedures were appropriate, although in our survey over a third of prisoners said they had felt unsafe on their first night. Induction worked well. A safer custody unit had been established but links between relevant areas were not made and there was little indication that bullying was well identified or dealt with. Many more prisoners than the training prison comparator and than last time had felt unsafe and this was particularly true of vulnerable prisoners. There was relatively little self-harm but support for those at risk was inadequate. Emergency cell procedures on H-blocks were unsafe. Use of force, while not high, had increased significantly.

HP6 Respondents to our survey were generally negative about their experience of escorts, although few had long journeys. All prisoners continued to be handcuffed in cellular vehicles without seatbelts, which made them feel unsafe. Men transferring from Maghaberry were given little notice and no information about Magilligan and some came with only weeks to their release.

HP7 Reception was clean and well ordered and relationships were good. Prisoners were usually able to make a telephone call on their first day but at their own expense. There was no advance for those who arrived without funds. Although we observed appropriate searching in reception, only 58% of respondents said that the search had been carried out sensitively, which compared poorly with the comparator <sup>1</sup> and was also worse than in 2004.

HP8 New arrivals we spoke to reported a good first night experience, with an individual interview, access to showers and tuck shop the next day. However, only 63% in our survey, against a comparator of 86% and the 2004 result of 73%, said they felt safe on their first night. A higher percentage than the comparator said they had received help with problems in the first 24 hours. Prisoners in our survey and those we spoke to were positive about induction.

HP9 More than double the percentage of prisoners than the comparator said they had felt unsafe in the prison and more said they had been victimised and insulted by other prisoners. Perceptions of safety were less good than in 2004 and were particularly poor among prisoners who were vulnerable because of their offence. A safer custody unit had been established but more needed to be done to create better links across all aspects of safety. There was very little use of the anti-bullying strategy, with only three investigations to date in 2006.

HP10 Levels of self-harm were low and a good action plan had been developed to take forward points from the coroner's verdict in the one self-inflicted death in recent years. Occasionally, prisoners who had self-harmed were held in special accommodation in

---

<sup>1</sup> The comparator figure is calculated by aggregating all survey responses from other training prisons together and so is not an average

the special supervision unit (SSU) in strip clothing but no records were kept. A good proportion of staff had been trained in the prisoner at risk (PAR) procedures but PAR 1s were often not specific enough about what needed to be done to provide support or follow up concerns. Reviews were usually multidisciplinary, but prisoners were not routinely involved. The alarm bell in cells in the H-blocks was the same as for accessing night sanitation, which risked delays in identifying emergencies.

- HP11 Physical security was greater than required for the categories of prisoner at Magilligan. There was little dynamic security and the security department did not actively promote security awareness, so the formal systems were ineffective, with little use of security information reports, and poor analysis of them. Many staff were reluctant to commit information in writing and the reliance on informal procedures failed to provide assurances about the validity of information and was open to abuse. Staff searching was too predictable to be effective.
- HP12 All prisoners entering the SSU were required to have a full search without an individual risk assessment. The regime in the unit was very basic with a punitive approach and little staff interaction with prisoners. There was no staff selection policy. No records were kept for most prisoners held there. The use of the SSU for 48 hours following a positive indication by the drugs dog was disproportionate and ineffective. The fabric of the SSU was poor; one damaged cell had been left dirty with human waste for three weeks and was a health hazard.
- HP13 Guidance on punishments for adjudications had recently been introduced but these were generally severe and cellular confinement was used in over 75% of cases. This almost always included the loss of all privileges including tobacco and telephone calls. There was a significant religious imbalance in the use of disciplinary procedures, with Catholics accounting for almost 70% of charges although they represented less than 50% of the population.
- HP14 Use of force was not high but there had been a significant increase in its use since the last inspection and there was no effective trend analysis. The records were poor and did not always give enough information to provide assurances that force had been used legitimately. There were no effective management checks. An observation cell in the SSU was occasionally used in circumstances that met the definition of a special cell but there were no formal records or authorisations for its use. We were concerned that a specific allegation of assault during use of force had not been properly investigated.
- HP15 The drug testing scheme was described as 'voluntary' but was in effect compliance testing. The main drugs used in the prison appeared to be benzodiazepines followed by cannabis. There was little indication of much opiate use. In our survey, 36% said it was easy to get hold of drugs in the prison; while higher than the comparator of 26%, this was lower than in 2004.

## Respect

---

- HP16 There continued to be relatively little active engagement between prisoners and staff on the H-blocks and the personal officer scheme was ineffective there. The external environment was grim. Living units were clean but the H-blocks were not fit for purpose, lacked adequate sanitation and were difficult to supervise. Prisoners were

positive about the food. The progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme was well understood but operated very strictly. There had been some progress with equal opportunity monitoring but discrepancies remained unaddressed. Prisoners who self-identified as white Irish had poorer perceptions of their treatment by staff than those identifying themselves as white British. Complaints handling was poor. Healthcare had improved with more mental health provision but there were inconsistent prison prescribing practices.

- HP17 Prisoners were reluctant to comment on relationships with staff, which were superficially relaxed, but in general distant and reactive. Though 76% of respondents to our survey said that most staff treated them with respect, only 60% said there was a member of staff they could turn to for help if they had a problem, which was significantly worse than the comparator and the 2004 survey. A much higher percentage than the comparator said they had been victimised by a member of staff and this was particularly the case for those who self-identified as white Irish<sup>2</sup> in our survey. We found some good responses to dealing with prisoners' problems but little evidence of proactive involvement and motivation of prisoners on the H-blocks, although there was more positive engagement on Sperrin and Foyleview.
- HP18 The personal officer scheme was not working effectively. Officers completed routine reports but these related almost entirely to behaviour and did not display much knowledge of the prisoner's individual circumstances; staff did not speak to the prisoner involved when preparing reports. Only 26% of respondents to our survey, compared to 42% in 2004, had met their personal officer in the first week and fewer than in 2004 found them helpful. Residential officers were not usually involved in resettlement planning.
- HP19 The external environment was grim and alienating, dominated by wire and fences with an ill-assorted collection of mainly unsuitable buildings on a large site, including many original Nissen huts. The H-blocks remained unfit for purpose and dormitories on Sperrin were too cramped. Cells and communal areas were clean and well looked after but difficult to supervise and the sanitation arrangements were wholly unsatisfactory. Prisoners had good access to clean clothes, sheets, cleaning materials and showers. Facilities for association were generally poor except on Sperrin and Foyleview. The SSU urgently needed replacing.
- HP20 Staff and prisoners were familiar with the progressive regimes and earned privileges (PREP) scheme but it operated too strictly, and inconsistently. Demotion frequently took place automatically following adjudications. Catholics were disproportionately represented on the basic level.
- HP21 A significantly higher percentage of prisoners than the comparator and than the 2004 survey said the food was good. A snack was now offered for Saturday evenings but the last proper meal of the day was still served far too early. Tuck shop goods were reasonably priced and prisoners could check their spends before ordering but the range of goods was limited.
- HP22 The accommodation for religious observance was little changed and the Catholic service took place in a cramped and unsuitable portakabin. Three services were held

---

<sup>2</sup> Our survey did not allow us to separate results by religion but we were able to do so by self identified ethnicity. We regarded white Irish as a close proxy for Catholic.

each Sunday for three separate groups and up to 65 prisoners attended. Prisoners in the SSU could not attend services but prisoners from Foyleview now could.

- HP23 Some monitoring by religious affiliation in regard to work, education and the PREP scheme had been introduced but little was being done to deal with discrepancies. Despite the Prison Service duty under the Northern Ireland Act 1998 to promote equality of opportunity between persons of different religious beliefs, there was no apparent promotion to staff or prisoners. Prisoners were not asked to self-identify their ethnic background. The prison described over 92% of prisoners as white British whereas 44% of respondents to our survey described themselves as white Irish. The survey indicated a number of significant differences between those who identified themselves as Irish and British. An equality and diversity manager had recently been appointed but the equality and diversity committee was poorly attended.
- HP24 There was no foreign national strategy. Four foreign national prisoners had been identified to the Immigration and Nationality Directorate though one claimed to be British. One immigration detainee had been held in unacceptable conditions in the SSU for some months after the end of his sentence. It was difficult for the prison to take forward work on diversity and the promotion of equality without any clear strategic central lead from the Northern Ireland Prison Service to challenge differential outcomes and eliminate direct and indirect discrimination.
- HP25 Prisoners had reasonable access to request and complaint forms but they had little confidence in the system and made relatively few complaints. According to our survey, satisfaction with promptness and fairness had fallen significantly since 2004. There was no central record of complaints and the procedures appeared to invite prisoners and staff to pass up complaints to senior managers, although the intention of the system was to resolve them at the lowest possible level. Replies were monitored but responses were impersonal and lacked sufficient detail, and trends over time were not analysed.
- HP26 There had been some improvements in healthcare services. In our survey, about half of prisoners, slightly higher than the comparator, rated the overall quality of healthcare as good or very good. Prisoners continued to be dissatisfied with the service of the doctor, principally because of a disparity of prescribing practice between Maghaberry and Magilligan. A recent health needs analysis had been completed and many of the issues identified were being taken forward. The increased use of in-patient beds reflected an increase in the number of older prisoners. Mental health services had progressed with the recruitment of registered mental nurses for primary mental health care, and good multidisciplinary case conferences were held. A service level agreement with a local mental health trust was expected to bring further improvements in care, but there had been no mental health needs analysis.

## Purposeful activity

---

- HP27 Time out of cell was reasonably good and unlock routines were mostly followed but slow movements curtailed activity time. Attendance at activities had improved. Some good work was taking place in education and resources had improved. There were also some good training opportunities in workshops but there were insufficient activity spaces, and some of those were mundane domestic jobs. The library was inadequate. Prisoners were positive about the gym.

- HP28 Those prisoners with an allocated activity had reasonable time out of their cells: about nine and a half hours on weekdays and Sundays, and six hours 40 minutes on Saturdays. Those without jobs were locked in their cells for up to one and a half hours each weekday morning but there were inconsistencies between H-blocks and some spent longer locked up. The published core day should have been achievable but movement to activities was slow and the lock up over lunch was excessive and led to curtailed times for activities. Association was rarely cancelled.
- HP29 We did not inspect the professional delivery of education but we looked at progress on recommendations. There was now a good quality assurance strategy and a formal partnership with Limavady College with contingency plans to cover absences. There were improved individual learning plans, but no overall management system to plan provision. There were clear links to resettlement planning but learning plans were not yet used in vocational areas. The education accommodation and classes had greatly improved and there were some good resources.
- HP30 The system for applications for jobs was better and prisoners from Foyleview were now able to complete vocational training in the main prison. Attendance and workshop opening times were also better and most workshops now offered opportunities for accreditation. Some of the workshop accommodation and facilities remained poor. There were too few activity places, with at least 80 prisoners without a job during the inspection. The high number of domestic jobs further masked unemployment. Short-term prisoners still had only limited opportunities for meaningful work but there were well advanced plans for industrial cleaning training and a new accredited multi-skills course.
- HP31 The library remained in a cramped and unsuitable portakabin. There was limited stock, no access for prisoners from Foyleview or healthcare and no provision for prisoners in the SSU. Although a slight improvement on the 2004 result, only 21% of respondents to our survey said they visited the library each week. Extra shelving and stock had been obtained and a more accessible location for the library identified but the move had been postponed.
- HP32 Prisoners were very positive about physical education. Access to recreational PE was relatively good, though it had declined, but there was no accredited training. The gym facilities were generally good and there was new cardio-vascular equipment. Changing and shower facilities were adequate but difficult to supervise.

## Resettlement

---

- HP33 The prison had an appropriate local resettlement strategy. Most prisoners had resettlement plans and all had their reintegration needs assessed at induction and pre-release programmes. However, plans and reintegration services were not sufficiently embedded into the prison as a whole and this affected outcomes for prisoners. Foyleview offered good resettlement opportunities. A reasonable range of offending behaviour programmes was run for sex offenders. There were no regular reviews of security categorisation. Visits arrangements were good and there was strong support for contact with family and friends. The Northlands drugs service provided positive support for prisoners with substance use problems.

- HP34 A local resettlement policy had been in place since September 2005, was underpinned by a needs analysis and was overseen by a committee that met quarterly. The resettlement policy did not describe the role of Foyleview, which acted as a resettlement unit. The prisoner survey and feedback from groups did not suggest that the strategy was fully embedded across the prison and there was little ownership of resettlement outside the prisoner development unit and Foyleview.
- HP35 All prisoners serving 28 days or longer had a resettlement plan prepared and the prisoner development unit staff had devised a sophisticated planning and review process. The plans were regularly updated but prisoners did not have a sense of ownership of their plans. Many were unaware they had a plan and plans were not completed or reviewed by officers who knew the prisoners well.
- HP36 Reintegration needs were well assessed through resettlement planning and at the induction programme and the pre-release programme. However, the survey indicated that some prisoners were not fully aware of how to obtain advice and help on some key reintegration areas. Prisoners in the survey, in groups and in individual interviews were consistently sceptical that officers would be prepared to help them with reintegration issues.
- HP37 Foyleview continued to provide some good reintegration opportunities for prisoners nearing the end of their sentences, with a number of prisoners working out in the community. The selection process for Foyleview had been reviewed and was more transparent than previously but, as at the last inspection, there continued to be an over-representation of Protestants. Prisoners complained about more stringent risk assessments than at Maghaberry but the rate of successful home leave applications had increased.
- HP38 Good efforts had been made to match offending behaviour programmes to need with sufficient tutors. Thirteen different programmes were run with a total of 79 groups planned for 2006-07. However, in the absence of a supportive and motivational environment many sex offenders refused to engage in offence-related work.
- HP39 There were no regular reviews of categorisation, which led to apparent anomalies with allocation; most of the minimum security prisoners lived in the more secure area of the prison. Without a clear up-to-date picture of the risk categories of all prisoners at Magilligan and in the rest of Northern Ireland, it was difficult to see how the Northern Ireland Prison Service could be sure that the present locations of prisoners was appropriate or that future planned accommodation would meet needs.
- HP40 Public protection was dealt with under the multi-agency sex offender risk assessment management (MASRAM) framework, and since the Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland (CJINI) inspection of MASRAM procedures, the prison was more engaged in the process. However, risk procedures still covered only sex offenders. A new child protection policy had been introduced in March 2006 and there were regular formal meetings between PBNI and visits staff to minimise risk to children visiting the prison.
- HP41 The visitors' centre run by NIACRO was well managed and comfortable. Good transport facilities were provided with prison minibus transport to and from the local station and NIACRO-operated minibuses from Belfast and Derry. A supervised play area in the visits hall was run by a qualified worker and regular child-centred visits were open to all prisoners.

- HP42 Two family liaison officers provided good support to visitors but were not always available as they were used to staff other areas. Visitors as a group had to accept closed visits or leave on a single drug dog indication without any other supporting intelligence. Seating in the visits room remained fixed and regimented. There was little delay to the start of visits and morning visits could last as long as three hours. All incoming and outgoing mail was still read and there were too few telephones in some areas.
- HP43 The existing drug strategy was out of date but a new draft Northern Ireland Prison Service drug strategy had been prepared and was out for consultation. The Northlands drug and alcohol team provided a very good service to prisoners and 43% of respondents to our survey, significantly better than the comparator, believed that the drugs and alcohol programmes would assist them on their release. The Northlands service had established good links with families and service providers in the community including for prisoners who were being released to addresses in England.

## Main recommendations

---

- HP44 The Northern Ireland Prison Service should develop a national strategy to promote equality and diversity, and to prevent direct and indirect discrimination in relation to race, religion, ethnicity, nationality and sexuality. This should include training for all prison staff, and a requirement for impact assessments of all policies, both within the service and in individual prison establishments.
- HP45 A review of arrangements for prisoners vulnerable because of their offence should be carried out to develop a strategy to ensure that they are held in conditions that help them feel safe, have appropriate access to regime activities and are encouraged to address their offending behaviour.
- HP46 A more holistic approach to safety should be developed by fully incorporating the work of the suicide prevention and anti-bullying committees into the safer custody committee and involving and consulting prisoners about how to make Magilligan a safer place.
- HP47 A nominated senior manager should be responsible for ensuring that all use of force is fully and properly recorded by all those involved, with a unique reference number for each incident.
- HP48 The special supervision unit should be acknowledged as unfit for purpose and replaced urgently.
- HP49 All prisoners should have a named personal officer who should produce regular reports on their personal circumstances and progress and contribute to meeting their resettlement targets.
- HP50 The demolition of the H-blocks and their replacement with more suitable accommodation, with integral sanitation, should be prioritised.

- HP51 Physical security in the prison should match the security needs of the population. Electric locking should be reduced and pass keys introduced to allow managers and staff access to all areas of the prison at any time.
- HP52 There should be thorough analysis, by religion and ethnicity, of access to regime activities and services to monitor and ensure equality of outcome.
- HP53 There should be sufficient high-quality education and work for all prisoners, supported by formal agreement or contract with the educational supplier.
- HP54 The resettlement culture in Magilligan should extend beyond specialists and become a core function of all staff who have contact with prisoners.



# Progress on main recommendations since the previous report

(The paragraph numbers at the end of each main recommendation refer to its location in the previous inspection report)

## Main recommendations

To the governor

---

- MR1 **The establishment should develop a safer custody strategy and procedures, taking in anti-bullying, suicide and self-harm prevention, and substance misuse. (HP41)**

**Partially achieved.** A very recent safer custody strategy had been written in March 2006. This described the proposed work for a safer custody committee that would bring together these three strands of work. At the time of the inspection, separate minutes were being produced for these meetings. A safer custody group (SCG) had been established and brought together managers and staff responsible for security and safer custody. It was staffed by two principal officers, one senior officer and three officers. One principal officer acted as the coordinator for suicide prevention and anti-bullying. We were told that a SCG strategy had been established and that the group had met three times but no minutes were available. The meeting was chaired by the deputy governor and was still at its formative stage.

- MR2 **The demolition of the H-blocks and their replacement with more suitable accommodation, with integral sanitation, should be prioritised. (HP42)**

**Not achieved.** The H-block accommodation remained.  
See main recommendation HP50

- MR3 **Physical security in the prison should match the security needs of the population. Electric locking should be reduced and pass keys introduced to allow managers and staff access to all areas of the prison at any time. (HP43)**

**Not achieved.** Physical security still dominated, although Magilligan held only medium and low risk prisoners. A few internal doors between residential units had been unlocked and swipe card portals had been introduced. This eased movement around some parts of the prison but managers were still not issued with pass keys and had to be let into residential units by staff. At least three members of staff were needed to unlock four doors on each H-block to access prisoners' accommodation. This was unnecessary.  
See main recommendation HP51

- MR4 **There should be thorough analysis, by religion and ethnicity, of access to regime activities and services to monitor and ensure equality of outcome. (HP44)**

**Partially achieved.** Some limited monthly monitoring by age and religious affiliation (Catholic, Protestant and non-denominational) of accommodation, work and activity,

and the progressive regimes and earned privileges (PREP) scheme had been introduced in June 2005. However, many other important areas were not monitored.

MR5 According to the most recent statistics (May 2006), 46% of prisoners were Catholic, 47% were Protestant and 7% were 'other'. Of the 384 Prison Service grade staff, 11% were Catholic, 79% were Protestant and 10% were 'other'. Catholics were still significantly under-represented on Foyleview and in the favoured orderly jobs, and over-represented on the basic level of the PREP scheme. Managers were aware of this but there was little evidence of any meaningful action taken to address it. The Northern Ireland Prison Service (NIPS) did not provide managers with a strategic lead in this area. Managers said that Foyleview was seen 'as a Protestant unit' and the Catholic priest had been asked to encourage Catholic prisoners to apply.

MR6 In our survey, no prisoner identified himself as black or from a minority ethnic group. Responses from prisoners identifying themselves as white Irish and white British highlighted significant differences between the groups in many important areas (see appendices).

MR7 An equality and diversity committee meeting due to meet quarterly had recently been introduced but the minutes evidenced limited evaluation and action. The meetings were poorly attended and did not include prisoner representatives.  
**See main recommendation HP52**

MR8 **There should be sufficient high-quality education and work for all prisoners, supported by formal agreement or contract with the educational supplier. (HP44)**

**Not achieved.** The range and quality of activity had improved but was still not meeting prisoners' needs. Eighty prisoners had no activity and the high number of those working as cleaners and domestic orderlies suggested that further unemployment was being masked.  
**See main recommendation HP53**

MR9 **Managers should ensure that all prisoners are delivered on time, each day, to education and work activities. (HP45)**

**Achieved.** Prisoners generally arrived at their workplace or education on time, although activity time was curtailed by slow movement to workshops (see section on work).

MR10 **There should be a local resettlement policy, based on a needs analysis; with an action plan to embed resettlement work into the prison as a whole, overseen by a committee and local manager. (HP46)**

**Partially achieved.** Magilligan's resettlement policy, introduced in September 2005, was based on a NIPS-wide needs profile and strategic review of resettlement services undertaken by the social services inspectorate in 2003. The policy was overseen by a committee, which was chaired by a governor and had met five times since September 2004. The 2005-07 action plan covered all NIPS establishments and was jointly owned by the NIPS and the Probation Board for Northern Ireland (PBNI).

MR11 Magilligan had invested considerable energy in its resettlement work. The dedicated resettlement areas (the prisoner development unit, Foyleview and Sperrin) had many

well-motivated staff but the emphasis on resettlement was not yet embedded across the entire workforce and culture of the prison. See **main recommendation HP54 and paragraph 8.15.**

- MR12 **There should be a mental health needs assessment to establish what primary mental health services are required. Arrangements should mirror community provision, including a comprehensive counselling service. (HP48)**

**Partially achieved.** A multidisciplinary mental health team had been established to coordinate and manage mental health services. Membership included healthcare staff, psychology staff, probation, the Northlands drug and alcohol team, and residential staff. The team had clear terms of reference and met at least monthly but no mental health needs assessment had been undertaken.

- MR13 There were three registered mental health nurses (RMNs), each of whom had a caseload of eight to ten patients. They took referrals from various sources and saw everyone with a history of self-harm. If mental health assessments were not completed at Maghaberry prison before transfer, the team at Magilligan took the referral. They aimed to see each patient at least weekly and arranged regularly reviewed individual exit strategies to enable them to take on new referrals.

- MR14 The prison was about to begin a service level agreement with Sperrin and Lakeland Health and Social Care Trust to provide assessment and advice on the practical management of prisoners with mental health issues.



# Progress on recommendations since the last report

## Section 1: Arrival in custody

### 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 induction prisoners are made aware of prison routines, how to access available services and how to cope with imprisonment.

#### Courts, escorts and transfers

---

- 1.1 Escorting staff should allow prisoners toilet stops when required and offer drinks during the journey. (1.5)

**Recommendation withdrawn.** There were no suitable facilities for a break between Maghaberry and Magilligan but the journey normally took no more than two hours. Prisoners were offered something to eat and drink on arrival at Magilligan.

- 1.2 Prisoners should not routinely travel handcuffed in secure vehicles unless individual assessments demonstrate a high level of risk. (1.6)

**Not achieved.** All prisoners were handcuffed in cellular vehicles and the lack of seatbelts was an additional risk.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

#### Additional information

---

- 1.3 In our survey, prisoners were generally negative about their experience of escorts, although few had long journeys. The one van we looked at was reasonably clean.
- 1.4 Of the 22 prisoners who arrived at Magilligan during the inspection, 15 had less than three months left to serve. Most had been given notice of their transfer from Maghaberry only that morning and they had not been given any information about Magilligan. One prisoner had wanted to complete a course he had begun at Maghaberry.
- 1.5 Few prisoners were required to attend court from Magilligan. A video link was used when appropriate.

#### Further recommendations

- 1.6 Unless there are well-evidenced security considerations, prisoners should be given more notice of planned transfers.

- 1.7 Allocations to Magilligan should be part of a planned progression to meet prisoners' needs, and should take account of sentence plan targets, closeness to home and time left to serve.

## Reception, first night and induction

---

### 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 induction prisoners are made aware of prison routines, how to access available services and how to cope with imprisonment.

### Additional information

---

- 1.8 Reception was clean and holding rooms were well supervised. Staff worked efficiently and were relaxed with prisoners. Reception closed at 4.30pm. Fourteen prisoners who arrived at 2pm on one day of the inspection were given essential items from their property and returned to collect the remainder the following day. A comprehensive information folder in each holding room explained the first night procedures for committals (new receptions). All committals were interviewed by the reception senior officer.
- 1.9 The searching procedures we saw in reception were appropriate but only 58% of respondents to our survey, against a comparator of 74%, said searches had been carried out sensitively. This was worse than in 2004.
- 1.10 Reception staff were informed in advance of any prisoners identified as vulnerable. These prisoners were held separately in reception but not when they moved to the induction landings. Few prisoners arrived on open prisoner at risk forms (PAR 1s). All committals were accommodated in single cells. The security department was responsible for identifying individuals who were not considered suitable to share.
- 1.11 Recent arrivals we met said their cells had been prepared and were reasonably clean. They were given a meal order sheet and tuck shop order form along with written information. All had the opportunity to shower.
- 1.12 All committals had individual interviews on their first night. These were held in quiet locations and generally handled sensitively. Officers had access to the prisoner's wing file from Maghaberry. All prisoners were asked if they could read and about any immediate concerns. One prisoner raised childcare concerns and wanted an immediate return to Maghaberry but no further information was sought or a referral made to the probation department. Instead, the prisoner was advised to speak to the senior officer about a transfer.
- 1.13 Prisoners were given essential information about the wing routine, including guidance on the operation of the night sanitation system, and signed to confirm that this had been explained to them. Compacts for in-cell television and cell property were signed and prisoners were told what to expect during induction.
- 1.14 Prisoners could make a telephone call but at their own expense. Anyone without telephone credit was advised to ask an officer for assistance in letting his family know of the transfer. Flasks for hot drinks at night were no longer issued but had to be bought through the tuck shop. Those who had money could order tuck and received it the following day. No funds were

advanced to prisoners without money. Prisoners were allowed a committal visit and visits booked while at Maghaberry were honoured where possible. We met several prisoners who had been able to arrange a visit within days of their transfer to Magilligan.

- 1.15 In our survey, only 63% of respondents, against a comparator of 86% and the 2004 result of 73%, had felt safe on their first night. However, a higher percentage than the comparator said they had received help with problems in the first 24 hours.
- 1.16 Survey results about induction were better than the comparators. Eighty-six per cent of respondents said they had been on induction in the first week and 74% said it covered all they needed to know. Induction started on a Monday and lasted five days. Staff from a range of agencies and departments contributed, including NIACRO, Northlands (alcohol and drugs support), the chaplaincy, psychology and healthcare. Sessions were delivered through slide presentations, and the induction officers who delivered the majority of the programme had been trained in presentation skills. Sessions were relaxed and stimulated discussion. All committals could see a dentist during induction and were given a tour of the prison.

#### **Further recommendations**

- 1.17 The location of vulnerable prisoners with others on the induction wing should be fully risk-assessed.
- 1.18 Prisoners arriving at Magilligan should be allowed a free telephone call to inform family and friends of their whereabouts.



# Section 2: Environment and relationships

## Accommodation and facilities

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 The general environment had not changed. Apart from the main living accommodation and the special supervision unit (SSU), the site consisted of a collection of temporary buildings, many of which had been in place for several years. Most of the site appeared old and scruffy.
- 2.2 The three H-blocks, which housed the majority of prisoners, remained entirely unfit for purpose. Night sanitation arrangements were still inadequate. Prisoners were issued with chamber pots and anyone wanting to use the lavatory at night or during patrol state had to depend on an unreliable unlock system. Not only was the system unsatisfactory and disrespectful, it was also unsafe (see section on suicide and self-harm). Despite the poor sanitation arrangements, prisoners' cells and all communal areas were generally clean and well looked after.
- 2.3 Effective supervision was difficult to maintain on the H-blocks. This was exacerbated by the fact that different staff controlled movement through specific gates and the residential units were locked up during the core day. Apart from the need to provide a safe environment for some vulnerable prisoners, this level of security was generally unnecessary for the type of prisoner at Magilligan (see section on security and rules).
- 2.4 The SSU building was in poor condition and in urgent need of replacing (see section on segregation).
- 2.5 Foyleview provided good accommodation where prisoners had keys to their rooms and could use the facilities when required. Sperrin House, which was not in use as residential accommodation at the time of the last inspection, held up to 64 prisoners. This temporary building housed (on separate spurs) vulnerable prisoners and prisoners preparing for Foyleview. Each spur contained four bunk bed dormitories holding eight prisoners. The rooms were too small and allowed no privacy. Prisoners could move around within their spur at all times and had full access to all facilities. The unit was very clean and well maintained.
- 2.6 Association facilities for prisoners on the main H-blocks were poor. The fabric on the pool tables on H2 B wing, for example, had been torn some time ago and had not been replaced. Facilities on Sperrin and Foyleview were better, with each unit having rooms with cardiovascular equipment and television rooms.
- 2.7 All prisoners could wear their own clothes. Results from our survey were generally positive about access to clean clothes, bedding, cleaning materials and showers.

### Further recommendations

- 2.8 Internal gates in residential units should be unlocked during the core day to allow greater freedom of movement.

- 2.9 Broken association equipment should be replaced.
- 2.10 The number of beds in dormitories in Sperrin House should be reduced and low-level screening installed to provide some privacy.

## Staff-prisoner relationships

---

### Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are treated respectfully by 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.

- 2.11 Staff should be encouraged to engage with prisoners during association periods. (2.17)

**Not achieved.** There was very little interaction between prisoners and staff. Significantly fewer respondents to our survey than in 2004 said staff normally spoke to them most of the time during association.

### Additional information

---

- 2.12 Prisoners we met had mixed views about relationships with staff. Many suggested that staff left them alone if they did not bother them. Although distant, relationships appeared generally relaxed and 76% in our survey said most staff treated them with respect. However, only 60%, significantly lower than the comparator and the 2004 result, said there was a member of staff they could turn to for help if they had a problem. A higher percentage than the comparator said they had been victimised by a member of staff and this was particularly so among those who designated themselves as white Irish.
- 2.13 We found some good examples of officers dealing with problems brought to them by prisoners but there was little evidence of proactive attempts to get to know prisoners and motivate them to meet resettlement plan targets. Relationships on Sperrin and Foyleview were much better than on the H-blocks.

## Personal officers

---

### Expected outcome:

Prisoners' relationships with their personal officers are based on mutual respect, high expectations and support.

- 2.14 The personal officer scheme should be linked to sentence planning, and personal officers should be responsible for monitoring and chasing the completion of targets set for prisoners. (2.24)

**Not achieved.** The personal officer scheme was not linked to sentence planning, and officers reported little or no opportunity to contribute to the development of plans or reviews. **We repeat the recommendation.**

## **Additional information**

---

- 2.15 Prisoners on Foyleview and Sperrin were allocated a personal officer but other prisoners were not and their reports were completed by different wing officers according to a rota. In our survey, 26%, against 42% in 2004, said they had met their personal officer within the first week and 42%, against 52% in 2004, thought their personal officer was helpful. Prisoners on Foyleview were most positive about their personal officer. Our survey highlighted clear differences between those identifying themselves as Irish or British.
- 2.16 Officers were required to write weekly reports on prisoners on the basic and standard levels of the PREP scheme, and monthly reports on enhanced prisoners. We looked at 30 wing files from across all wings. Virtually all comments in reports related to behaviour on the wing and included very little about progress with sentence plans or resettlement targets. None of the reports suggested that officers had any knowledge of prisoners' personal circumstances or significant events in their lives, although some wing files showed that prisoners were helped to maintain contact with their family at times of crisis. Not all reports were signed by prisoners as required and there was no evidence that staff had spoken to prisoners before writing them. Reports for foreign national prisoners did not distinguish them from any other prisoners.
- 2.17 The published instructions to officers about report writing suggested that officers should comment on prisoner conduct in relation to the regime, staff and other prisoners, work and education, personal hygiene and behaviour during 'lock-down'. They did not suggest that officers should demonstrate interest in the prisoner as a person or provide any challenge or encouragement to help him prepare for release.
- 2.18 A principal officer checked 20 reports each month and some had been signed by senior officers after checking. Many wing files contained a senior manager quality check form but the only two that were signed were over six months old.



# 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 A multidisciplinary anti-bullying committee should be established and should meet monthly. (3.8)**

**Achieved.** A committee had been established in March 2005 and met regularly, chaired by the deputy governor, but was not yet fully effective. There were representatives from a range of departments but education, workshops and healthcare staff did not attend regularly and there were no prisoner representatives. Cases were not discussed and information on potential indicators of bullying was not presented. The fact that a survey of prisoners' perceptions and experiences of bullying had highlighted significant areas of concern was noted at the meeting in September 2005 but there was no indication of what had been done about it. The meeting did not make links with wider safer custody issues.

**3.2 A comprehensive and detailed policy to address bullying behaviour and to support the victim should be devised. This should be well publicised and staff and prisoners trained in its application and encouraged to use it. (3.9)**

**Not achieved.** The policy from 2001 was still in use. Anti-bullying posters were displayed in many areas and an anti-bullying booklet had been produced, although no committal prisoners had received it. The induction programme included a session on the anti-bullying strategy, 'Safe at Magilligan' (SAM), but the strategy was underused. There had been 24 investigations in 2005 and three to date in 2006. The anti-bullying register did not record how many of these had resulted in prisoners being placed on SAM 3, where cases were considered by an anti-bullying management board for formal action. The minutes of the anti-bullying committee suggested that only three cases had been considered since May 2005, all of which had led to prisoners being placed on closer observations and daily reports.

**3.3 Many investigations were inconclusive and the main outcome was to separate both parties. Two cases of threats had been referred to the police. There was no evidence that any prisoner had been referred to the psychology or probation departments for assessment for groups as described in the local strategy. The 2001 strategy also indicated that instigators of bullying could be placed in the special supervision unit on a special regime for bullies described as a 'bullying regime' but there were no recent examples of this.**

**3.4 None of the recent incident reports (SAM 1) and incident investigations (SAM 2) we looked at made any reference to routine support for victims. A drama workshop held for vulnerable prisoners had sought to explore bullying-related issues and it was hoped that another could be run.**

**3.5 Sixty-five staff had attended the short, informative training course on the anti-bullying strategy. Difficulties in getting staff to attend had been raised at the anti-bullying committee, and we**

were told that part of the problem was the priority given to other staff training such as for control and restraint.

- 3.6 Not enough was done to analyse or investigate information that may be indicative of bullying, such as security information reports (SIRs), adjudications, reports of non-accidental injuries and requests to move location. We found some cases of suspected bullying described in SIRs that had not been referred for investigation.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

### **Additional information**

---

- 3.7 Perceptions of safety were poorer than in 2004. In our survey, 54% of respondents, against a comparator of 25%, said they had felt unsafe in the prison, and higher numbers said they had been victimised and insulted by other prisoners. In some prisoner at risk (PAR 1) cases and some bullying incidents, prisoners had felt unsafe because of intimidation from others with paramilitary associations. Many prisoners indicated that they felt victimised by staff.
- 3.8 A survey carried out on behalf of the prison in July 2005 indicated that nearly a third of prisoners had experienced some behaviour indicative of bullying. Most reported psychological or verbal aggression and many said their response was to remain in their cells.
- 3.9 Eighty-three (21%) of prisoners were identified as vulnerable, mainly because of the nature of their offence. Although largely accommodated separately, they were partially integrated and completed induction with other committals. In our survey, perceptions of safety were worse among vulnerable prisoners, with 69% of those on H2 C and D and Sperrin saying they had felt unsafe at some time. Over three times as many vulnerable prisoners said insulting remarks had been made about them and over twice as many said they had been victimised by another prisoner. Some prisoners highlighted areas such as healthcare, legal visits, the video link and the smoking area in the prisoner development unit as places where they felt unsafe. Separate tables were used for vulnerable prisoners in visits, and the furniture workshop provided work mainly for vulnerable prisoners.
- 3.10 Although we were told that movements were staggered to reduce the potential for conflict, some vulnerable prisoners described feeling intimidated when walking down 'the phase' (the main thoroughfare between activity areas and the H-blocks). One elderly vulnerable prisoner convicted of sex offences was living on the induction unit. He described some intimidating comments made to him but felt reasonably safe largely because of the number of staff around. One prisoner on a PAR 1 located on H2 C and D felt vulnerable as he believed other prisoners treated him as a sex offender although he was not. There were examples of difficulties finding suitable locations for vulnerable prisoners who needed protection.

## **Self-harm and suicide**

---

**Expected outcome:**

**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, and appropriately trained and have access to proper equipment and support.**

### 3.11 Staff training in self-harm and suicide awareness should be increased. (3.14)

**Achieved.** A total of 263 staff had been trained in the PAR 1 procedures. A shortened suicide awareness 'roadshow' had been delivered to staff on the residential units and a Samaritan had provided some training for managers.

#### **Additional information**

---

- 3.12 The NIPS policy on self-harm and suicide had been amended in June 2005, taking into account the recommendations of a 'Review of non-natural deaths in Northern Ireland Prison Service establishments June 2002-March 2004'. An action plan for the whole service had subsequently been developed and had, for example, led to the development of safer custody groups, and family care lines and encouragement to develop Listener schemes. The NIPS policy had also been incorporated in a wider strategy to reduce suicide levels throughout Northern Ireland. In addition to the local suicide prevention team, the suicide prevention coordinator attended the service-wide self-harm and suicide forum, where participants could share good practice and promote new initiatives.
- 3.13 Magilligan's self-harm and suicide prevention team had met four times between February 2005 and January 2006. It was chaired by a governor grade with between six and 11 people attending. Most areas were represented apart from the education department and workshops. Prisoners did not attend. The minutes reflected some discussion on important issues, such as the need to heighten awareness of the needs of elderly prisoners. The connection between self-harm and prisoners' past experiences was also acknowledged and a specialist who worked with survivors of trauma had been invited to speak at the meeting in January 2006. In March 2006, a new strategy had been put in place that aimed to bring together all security and safer custody issues but this was not yet fully established.
- 3.14 Although levels of self-harm were low and relatively few PAR 1s were opened, there was little analysis of information to allow monitoring of, for example, how many were vulnerable prisoners there were or to identify any patterns. The meeting minutes simply recorded that PAR 1 cases were discussed in detail. There had been nine incidents involving eight prisoners in the last five months. Seventeen PAR 1 forms had been opened since 1 January 2006; only one was open at the time of this inspection. Most were open for less than ten days. PAR 1 forms had not been opened in all appropriate cases, such as that of one prisoner who had self-harmed, received medical treatment and subsequently been taken to the special supervision unit under restraint.
- 3.15 The last self-inflicted death was in 2003. Some progress had been made in response to the coroner's verdict and the jury's observations, including improving communications between prisons. Some other aspects of care had improved through the subsequent introduction of the PAR 1 procedures in 2004 and following the review of non-natural death in the NIPS.
- 3.16 A service-wide family care line provided contact numbers for each prison. At Magilligan, this was checked daily by healthcare staff. It had been used twice since the beginning of the year.
- 3.17 Some prisoners who had self-harmed had been located in special accommodation in strip clothing. Although this did not appear to be routine, the frequency and circumstances were not recorded.
- 3.18 PAR 1 reviews were held regularly (usually weekly) and were chaired by a principal officer. Most of the reviews we looked at were multidisciplinary and included representatives from probation, psychology and healthcare but the designation of those attending was not always

recorded. Whether or not the prisoner had been invited and had attended was not recorded, nor was there any indication of efforts made to contact families.

- 3.19 Initial concerns identified on opening PAR 1 forms were not always followed up. The discharge letter of one man who had returned from hospital following an overdose recommended that he be reviewed by a psychiatrist but there was no reference to this in his care plan record.
- 3.20 Duty managers were required to sign a checklist to confirm that they had been informed of every prisoner on an open PAR 1 form but the level of watch identified for prisoners was not always recorded. One of the PAR 1 forms we looked at contained no entries for a full day. Support plans were often not specific enough. In several cases, they consisted simply of 'ensure observation', while another was 'normal location'. There was no routine audit of closed PAR 1 forms by a senior manager to monitor quality. One person's PAR 1 was closed without a review on the day he was released from the prison. We were told other departments and agencies took a role in supporting individuals but few support plans evidenced this. Prisoners moved to education and workshops unescorted and PAR 1 booklets did not accompany them, which meant that important observations from staff were not recorded.
- 3.21 One agency offered some counselling for victims of abuse but did not work with perpetrators. Bereavement counselling was offered through the probation department and the chaplaincy.
- 3.22 The night sanitation arrangements were inherently risky because the emergency alarm was the same as the bell used by prisoners when they needed to go to the toilet. This meant that calls could not be prioritised, and there could therefore be delays in responding to emergencies, which was very unsafe.
- 3.23 There were four Listeners and nine more completed training during the inspection. Those we met felt generally supported by staff, and Samaritans said there was good support from management. Listeners had sometimes contributed to induction but did not do so during the inspection. About seven calls were made each month. Listener suites were available on each H-block and in the healthcare centre. We were told these were used during the day and at night but no record of use was kept despite a recommendation to this effect in a standards audit report of July 2004. There was a protocol for their use. The suites were of a safer cell design and included a direct telephone link to the Samaritans. Prisoners could also telephone the Samaritans from landing telephones but paid the local rate to do so.
- 3.24 Kits to help staff when responding to a prisoner hanging were located in each class office and on the 'circle' (the central area of each H-block). The seals were checked routinely. Officers did not carry ligature knives but the suicide prevention coordinator suggested that the permanent night guards should carry them. There were no emergency radio codes to alert medical staff to the nature of an emergency. Over 50 staff were first aid trained.

#### **Further recommendations**

- 3.25 Members of the suicide prevention team should attend meetings regularly. This team should include representatives from the education department, workshops and prisoners.
- 3.26 PAR 1s should be monitored and analysed to identify the number of prisoners involved and any trends.
- 3.27 PAR 1 forms should be opened in all cases when a prisoner self-harms.

- 3.28 All incidents where prisoners have self-harmed and are placed in special accommodation or strip/protective clothing should be recorded and monitored by the safer custody committee.
- 3.29 A senior manager should audit the quality of closed PAR 1 forms with particular emphasis on prisoners' attendance at reviews, the efforts made to contact families, where appropriate, and the quality of care plans and daily entries.
- 3.30 The use of Listener suites should be recorded.
- 3.31 Prisoners should have free telephone access to the Samaritans and other help lines from the landing telephones.
- 3.32 All night guards should carry ligature knives and be trained in their use.
- 3.33 Emergency radio codes alerting healthcare staff to the nature of any self-harm incident should be introduced.

## Equality, race relations and foreign nationals

### 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.

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

- 3.34 The prison should have an equality and diversity committee, to examine and investigate monitoring statistics, supported by an equality and diversity officer. (3.22)

**Partially achieved.** A senior officer had been appointed as the equality and diversity manager in September 2005. He collated the monthly statistics by religion and age and was aiming to develop a much broader monitoring scheme. He had no job description and had received only an estimated three days detailed to this work in the past eight months. An equality and diversity committee met monthly but was poorly attended.

### Further recommendations

- 3.35 The equality and diversity manager should have a job description and should be given enough time for the work.
- 3.36 Members of the equality and diversity committee should attend all meetings regularly.

- 3.37 There should be a policy for dealing with foreign national prisoners, and a coordinator appointed to ensure their needs are met. (3.23)

**Not achieved.** There was no policy or strategy. Administration staff told resettlement staff and the equality and diversity manager when a foreign national prisoner was identified. The action

plan stated that 'all prisoners recorded as either nil or other religious denomination...will be interviewed by the equality and diversity officer to identify any specific requirements'. We were told that foreign national prisoners were interviewed to identify their needs but there was no record of this in their wing files.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

### **Additional information**

---

- 3.38 Despite the obvious potential to discriminate on religious and other grounds and the evident imbalance in some areas, the NIPS had no corporate strategy in the areas of equality, diversity, race relations or foreign national prisoners. Although there was some limited religious monitoring, managers and staff appeared unwilling or unable to challenge discrepancies.
- 3.39 The prison was not required to monitor prisoners' ethnicity and there was only one black prisoner. The prison described over 92% of its prisoners as having an ethnic background of white British (see population profile in the appendices), whereas 44% of respondents to our survey described themselves as white Irish, which roughly approximated to the Catholic population. Our survey indicated a number of significant differences in perceptions about treatment between those who identified themselves as white Irish and white British. White Irish respondents were much less positive about their general treatment by staff and access to help to support them on release. However, they were generally more positive about safety from other prisoners, access to exercise and association, and involvement with sentence planning. There was no promotion of diversity to staff or prisoners or any effort to challenge cultural or sectarian divides.
- 3.40 Four foreign national prisoners had been reported to the Immigration and Nationality Directorate (IND), even though one prisoner claimed to hold a British passport. Foreign national prisoners did not feel they were treated differently but there was no evidence of any action to identify and meet their needs. Managers said that foreign national prisoners could have a free telephone call 'if they asked for one'. One detainee, held in unacceptable conditions in the special supervision unit, had finished his sentence in December 2005. Despite the best efforts of the NIPS and representations to IND he was still awaiting deportation.

#### **Further recommendations**

- 3.41 Prisoners should be asked to self-identify their ethnic background on entry to prison and the information should be used to monitor and promote equality of opportunity.
- 3.42 Immigration detainees should not be held in prison after the end of their sentence.

## **Family and friends**

---

### **Expected outcomes:**

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

- 3.43 A formally agreed limit of mail and telephone calls should be monitored and censored. This should be adhered to. (3.39)

**Not achieved.** All outgoing mail was read by wing staff and all incoming mail was read by the armoury and censor officer. All telephone calls were recorded but how many were monitored was unclear.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 3.44 **The passive drug dog should be used in conjunction with other intelligence. Collective restrictions should not be placed on a group of visitors. (3.40)**

**Not achieved.** As at the last inspection, an entire visitor group was offered a closed visit or refused entry following a single drugs dog indication. No supporting intelligence was required.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 3.45 **Seating in the visits hall should be more comfortable and conducive to a relaxed atmosphere. (3.41)**

**Not achieved.** The prison considered the fixed and uncomfortable seating 'fit for purpose'. We did not agree.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 3.46 **Child-centred visits should be available to more prisoners and their children, and family days available to all prisoners. (3.42)**

**Achieved.** Child-centred visits and family days were available to all prisoners, including those on the basic level of the progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme.

- 3.47 **Family liaison officers should be supported by their managers and peers and should be given facility time to carry out their role effectively. (3.43)**

**Not achieved.** There were only two family liaison officers (FLOs) compared to three at the last inspection. Their role included providing information and support to visitors and prisoners as well as organising and running the children's days. The child-centred days were run twice a month on Saturdays, which meant FLOs coming in on their usual day off and receiving time off in lieu. Managers were assisting one FLO to undertake a counselling course and both had recently undertaken child protection training along with the visits senior officer. However, FLOs continued to receive too little facility time to liaise fully with prisoners' families during visits and were often detailed to work elsewhere. The action plan stated that FLOs kept a journal detailing the family work undertaken but this was not the case.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

#### **Further recommendation**

- 3.48 A formal record should be kept of work undertaken by the family liaison officers.

#### **Additional information**

- 3.49 In our survey, 45% of respondents, against a comparator of 39%, said staff had opened legal letters. The armoury and censor officer did not keep a record of any opened accidentally.
- 3.50 Telephones on the wings were available all day but there were too few telephones on Sperrin and Foyleview.

### Further recommendations

- 3.51 Legal correspondence opened in error should be recorded.
- 3.52 Additional telephones should be provided on Sperrin and Foyleview.

## 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.

- 3.53 All request/complaint forms should be centrally recorded and copies of completed cases should be centrally filed. (3.52)

**Not achieved.** Following the introduction of a new system in Northern Ireland prisons, requests were now separated from complaints. Each residential unit kept its own complaints log rather than their being centrally logged. Residential units were supposed to copy all replies to the administration group but there was little confidence that this was always done. **We repeat the recommendation.**

- 3.54 Senior managers should regularly check the quality and appropriateness of replies. (3.53)

**Not achieved.** We looked at 20 recent replies, the quality of which varied considerably. None addressed the complainant directly and six merely confirmed the nature of the complaint in the expectation that it would be referred to a senior staff member. Four made no reference to any investigation and one simply said it was the prisoner's word against the officer's with no indication that the officer had given his version of events. Although the head of residence read replies copied to the administration group, there was no evidence of comments on the quality of complaint handling or any action taken as a result. (see 3.59)

- 3.55 Senior managers should have access to information that identifies any trends in the grounds for complaints. (3.54)

**Partially achieved.** The head of residence prepared a monthly report analysing completed complaint replies. This indicated where the complaint had originated, the subject matter and how many had been dealt with at the first stage of the process. However, there was no analysis over time to allow longer-term trends to be identified.

- 3.56 Managers should identify the reasons why prisoners are under-using confidential access and appeal routes, and encourage them to do so. (3.55)

**Partially achieved.** There had been a random survey of 70 prisoners but the results were awaiting analysis. The new complaint system provided better confidential access and appeal routes, including to the Ombudsman.

## **Additional information**

---

- 3.57** The new system did not allow for easy management, monitoring or central analysis. With no central register, the manager had to rely on examining logs in all seven accommodation areas and on all completed replies being copied to the administration group (see paragraph 3.54). The design of the complaint forms meant that complaints were not numbered sequentially and, with the appeal sections integrated into them, prisoners and staff felt encouraged to seek to have the matter dealt with by senior managers. Staff had not been trained in resolving complaints informally. There was no analysis of complaints by ethnicity or religion.
- 3.58** In our survey, 82% of respondents, compared to 53% at our last inspection, said it was easy to get a complaints form. About 22 complaints were made each month, which was relatively few, and prisoners expressed little confidence in how these were handled. Only 13%, against a comparator of 22% and 19% at our last inspection, felt complaints were sorted out fairly. Twenty-two per cent, against a comparator of 13%, said they had been encouraged to withdraw a complaint. This figure rose to 29% for white Irish prisoners compared to only 16% of white British prisoners.

### **Further recommendations**

- 3.59** Senior managers should quality assure replies to complaints and take action where replies are of an unsatisfactory standard.
- 3.60** Senior managers should monitor and analyse trends in complaints over time, including subject, place, promptness and ethnicity/religion of the complainant.
- 3.61** The complaints system should be revised to ensure that staff dealing with complaints are trained in informal resolution, prisoners can take complaints about staff to an appropriate senior level in confidence, impartial investigations take place and replies to complaints are monitored for quality.



## 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 There should be a common approach to smoking cessation services and the provision of nicotine replacement therapy across the Northern Ireland Prison Service (NIPS) to ensure continuity of provision. (4.30)

**Achieved.** Smoking cessation services across the NIPS had been brought in line with the services provided at Magilligan. Unlike at our last inspection, prisoners did not raise smoking cessation services as a problem.

- 4.2 Healthcare staff should be involved in the arrangements for prisoners being released to assist them in accessing health services. (4.31)

**Achieved.** Healthcare staff were involved in the discharge programme run by the prisoner development unit and explained how to access primary care services on release. The healthcare manager had permission from the Central Services Agency for the prison to apply for medical cards for prisoners without one, who could then register with a GP on release. Prisoners were also given a letter to their doctor detailing any care and treatment given to them while in prison.

- 4.3 The medicines and therapeutics committee should produce relevant written policy documents, or standard operating procedures, to define the systems in operation. In particular the in-possession and special sick policies should be updated. (4.32)

**Achieved.** The joint medicines and therapeutics committee met quarterly. As well as discussing medicines issues, it was used as a strategy meeting for prison healthcare in Northern Ireland. A nurse saw prisoners daily and assessed them using formalised triage protocols before either referring them to the GP or dealing with their complaint as appropriate. All prisoners were risk assessed to determine their suitability for in-possession medication. The in-possession medicines were given daily, weekly or monthly and were distributed during the daily medication round. There was no system for prisoners to confirm receipt of their medications and prisoners on the H-blocks did not have a secure place to store them.

### Further recommendations

- 4.4 Patients should sign to confirm receipt of in-possession medications.

- 4.5 Prisoners should have secure lockers in which to store their medications.

- 4.6 The pharmacy contract should be reviewed and the pharmacist should be encouraged to take a more active role in the provision of healthcare at the prison. Pharmacist-led clinics should be introduced to allow patients to discuss their medication, and to supply medicines for minor ailments. (4.33)

**Not achieved.** The pharmacy contract had been in place since August 2005. Pharmacy-led

clinics were being piloted at Maghaberry but had not yet been introduced at Magilligan. The pharmacist was undertaking a supplementary prescribing course in order to provide a comprehensive service to prisoners in the future.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 4.7 The system for issuing prescriptions should be reviewed and simplified to reduce the need for transcription and duplication and thereby reduce the risk of error. (4.34)**

**Not achieved.** The system for issuing prescriptions had not changed. It remained complicated, with too many opportunities for transcription and other errors. The prison was considering two options for change: a clinical IT system and a new prescription and administration chart.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 4.8 Induction medication packs should be provided so that all prisoners receive a supply of simple self-care medication, including paracetamol tablets, at the time of admission. (4.35)**

**Not achieved.** Prisoners were not given medication packs on induction and could not buy self-care medication from the tuck shop. The issue was being discussed by the joint medicines and therapeutics committee.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 4.9 Special sick records should be audited to ensure proper operation and detection of possible abuse or inappropriate supply. (4.36)**

**Partially achieved.** There was an audit sheet for each H-block treatment room and a quarterly audit of stock medications was carried out. However, the giving out of a single dose of stock medication was recorded only on the audit sheet and not on the prisoner's prescription and administration chart. As a result, there was no complete audit trail of medication usage.

---

#### **Further recommendation**

- 4.10 All medications administered should be recorded on the patient's prescription and administration chart.**

- 4.11 Patients who need a night time dose of medication should receive it at an appropriate time. (4.37)**

**Achieved.** Following the introduction of in-possession medications, all prisoners could take their medications at the appropriate times.

#### **Additional information**

---

- 4.12** In our survey, 50% of respondents, against a comparator of 44%, rated the quality of healthcare as good or very good. However, prisoners continued to be dissatisfied with the doctor, principally because his prescribing practices were not consistent with Maghaberry. They also commented that they had to stand to see the doctor while he sat down.

- 4.13** A local physical health needs assessment had identified a number of issues, over half of which were already being addressed. However, there had still been no mental health needs assessment to help inform the development of mental health services. A project was under

way to ensure that the needs of older prisoners were being addressed. A practice nurse from the local community also visited the prison once a month and had seen all prisoners over the age of 65 years. She intended to hold a clinic for all prisoners with identified respiratory conditions on her next visit.

- 4.14 The increase in the age profile of prisoners at Magilligan was reflected in the increased use of in-patient beds. Most in-patients had medical conditions and all had long stays in the department. The regime in the unit was relaxed and adapted to the prisoners' needs. Some of the more infirm patients were allowed to receive their visits in the unit rather than in the visits hall.
- 4.15 A hepatitis B vaccination programme had begun across the NIPS. Staff said the uptake had been encouraging and the programme was working well, although nursing staff had not received immunisation and vaccination training and could therefore administer the vaccinations only when the doctor was on site.
- 4.16 We were told that access to continuous professional development was difficult as staff could not always access the courses they wanted to undertake. There was no clear training strategy.

---

#### Further recommendations

- 4.17 A mental health needs assessment should be carried out to inform the development of services.
  - 4.18 Consultations with healthcare staff should be conducted in a manner similar to that in the community, with patients allowed to sit when seeing the doctor.
  - 4.19 Staff who administer vaccinations should have immunisation and vaccination training, including the treatment of anaphylaxis.
  - 4.20 A training needs analysis should be undertaken.
-



# 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 Coherent and inclusive quality assurance strategy and procedures should be developed for education provision. (5.6)

**Achieved.** A clear and comprehensive quality assurance strategy for education had been developed. Quality assurance was contracted to Limavady College, whose procedures included observation of teaching and learning, the use of feedback questionnaires and checks on documents.

- 5.2 There should be a formal partnership or written agreement with the education supplier. (5.7)

**Achieved.** A service level agreement had been signed with Limavady College in October 2005. This outlined measures for compliance and contract review and clear requirements for quality of provision.

- 5.3 There should be an effective contingency plan to cover for staff absences in the education department. (5.8)

**Achieved.** Three new staff members who could work flexibly across several areas of expertise had recently been security cleared.

- 5.4 Senior managers should collect and analyse meaningful data across the education provision and use it to inform decisions; this should include a coherent management information system to plan future provision. (5.9)

**Partially achieved.** Data on retention and achievements was collected for all programmes. This was beginning to help managers make meaningful decisions about the current provision but they were not yet using it to help plan ahead. Detailed data on prisoners' religion, ethnicity and age was also collected for equality of opportunity. This was used well to monitor where prisoners were located but was not used to monitor performance such as retention and achievements on accredited courses. Data continued to be collated in different formats and no coherent management information system was yet in place.

---

### Further recommendation

- 5.5 Senior managers should use data from across the education provision as part of a coherent management information system to plan future provision.
-

5.6 There should be better recording and use of learning plans. (5.10)

**Partially achieved.** Updated and revised learning plans had been introduced in the education department and were used by staff. These were well recorded, with clear links to sentence planning, and staff and prisoners found them useful. However, learning plans were not yet used in most vocational areas.

---

**Further recommendation**

5.7 Learning plans should be used in all vocational areas.

---

**Library**

5.8 The library should be housed in better accommodation (5.17)

**Not achieved.** The library remained in a cramped portakabin and contained too little stock. Larger accommodation had been identified and extra stock had been donated from a recently closed public library. Plans for a move had been abandoned in favour of waiting for a new accommodation block to be completed at the end of 2007. This had delayed the much needed improvement and created further uncertainty as no detailed plans were yet available.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

5.9 All prisoners should be able to use the library at least once a week. (5.18)

**Not achieved.** No detailed attendance information was available. Our survey indicated that only 21% of prisoners, significantly lower than the comparator of 58%, used the library at least once a week.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

5.10 Prisoners on Foyleview and in the special supervision unit and patients in healthcare should have access to a full library service. (5.19)

**Not achieved.** Prisoners from Foyleview and in the healthcare unit could not use the library and had access to only a small stock of books. Those in the special supervision unit had no access to the library or any stock in the unit and were often forbidden any books by the conditions of their segregation (see section on segregation).  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

---

## Work

**Expected outcomes:**

**Prisoners are engaged in safe work and are treated fairly. Work should prepare prisoners for employment on release and help to reduce offending.**

5.11 The allocation of all prisoner jobs should be managed centrally. (5.29)

**Achieved.** A labour allocation board met weekly and included the industrial manager and labour allocation manager, who also managed the prisoner development unit. Job applications were considered fairly and although education and learning and skills were still managed separately, the industrial manager and the head of education liaised well. Prisoners who were

transferred to Foyleview could now access the main prison compound each day to complete their vocational courses.

**5.12 Prisoners serving a short sentence should have access to work other than domestic jobs. (5.30)**

**Partially achieved.** The only work available to short-term prisoners continued to be domestic cleaning but a new accredited multi-skills course had been introduced to allow them to gain DIY skills in preparation for release. Unfortunately, the course had been suspended following damage to the workshop roof during a protest just before the inspection. Plans to offer short-term prisoners accredited training in industrial cleaning were well advanced.

**5.13 A senior manager should be responsible for ensuring that workshops open on time, and that all prisoners allocated to work attend. (5.31)**

**Achieved.** A principal officer was been tasked to ensure timely attendance and this was recorded and monitored. He was assisted by a senior officer who oversaw movements to education and workshops. Attendance and workshop opening times had improved, although it took longer for prisoner to get to activities than to return to their living unit (see additional information below).

**5.14 Accreditation should be available for the range of vocational training on offer.**

**Achieved.** The range of vocational qualifications available had improved. Most workshops offered a range of vocational programmes, from basic accredited courses to national vocational qualifications.

**5.15 Accommodation for education classes and vocational workshops should be improved. (5.33)**

**Partially achieved.** Accommodation for education classes had greatly improved. Most classrooms had been refurbished and offered good learning environments. They were generally well equipped and many had new computers and up-to-date software, along with interactive whiteboards and videos. Resources for literacy and numeracy teaching were also good. However, facilities and accommodation for some workshops remained poor, with some vocational programmes still taught in outdated, poorly furnished and inappropriate huts.

---

**Further recommendation**

**5.16 Accommodation for vocational workshops should be improved.**

---

**Additional information**

---

**5.17** Activities for prisoners were too limited, particularly for a training prison. Eighty prisoners had no activity and the high number of cleaners and domestic orderlies suggested that further unemployment was being masked.

**5.18** The time taken for prisoners to reach activity and the long downtime over lunch represented a lost opportunity for constructive activity. Prisoners took an average of 20 minutes to reach their activity in the morning and afternoon but less than ten minutes to return. It was suggested that the additional time needed to move to activity was due to the system for controlling movement

from the living units, although no one could demonstrate how this system helped to maintain control. Prisoners started to return to their living units for lunch at 11.45am and, due to a shift pattern, were locked up from 12.30pm until 2.10pm each weekday. The long lunch break disrupted the delivery of accredited vocational training. Teaching and learning in accredited programmes were not being observed.

#### Further recommendations

- 5.19 The time taken to move to activities and the long downtime over lunch should be reduced.
- 5.20 Teaching and learning in accredited programmes should be observed.

## Physical education and health promotion

---

### Expected outcomes:

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.

- 5.21 Accredited programmes should be reintroduced and embedded in the physical education provision. (5.38)

**Not achieved.** First aid was the only accredited programme available linked to physical education (PE). The introduction of accredited training using suitably qualified staff was planned for later in the year.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

### Additional information

---

- 5.22 Prisoners in our focus groups said the gym was one of the better aspects of life in the prison. Those on the basic level of the progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme had one weekday session a week, those on the standard level had three and those on enhanced had up to five. Just over 50% of respondents to our survey, similar to the comparator, said they attended at least twice a week.
- 5.23 Between 150 and 160 prisoners (about 40%) used the gym each week compared to 50% at our last inspection. The continuing staff shortages were given as one reason for this, although the department comprised a principal officer, two senior officers and seven physical training instructors (PTIs), which seemed generous. A recently appointed PTI was unqualified and could undertake only general supervision. Restrictions on how many prisoners were allowed in the gym at any one time impacted on participation levels.
- 5.24 The gym was in a converted workshop and the ceiling was too low for a range of activities. However, there was new flooring in the fitness suite and 14 new exercise and weights machines had been provided. H-blocks and Foyleview also had fitness equipment.
- 5.25 The changing and shower facilities were adequate but the showers were difficult to supervise. Many prisoners ignored notices urging them to use the gym showers and gym staff said they could shower on their living unit.

### Further recommendations

- 5.26 Participation in physical education should be improved to at least 50%.
- 5.27 The gym showers should be adequately supervised.

## Faith and religious activity

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 5.28 Religious services should take place in a proper chapel or room dedicated for worship. (5.43)

**Not achieved.** We were told that the Free Presbyterian minister would not conduct services in accommodation used by Catholics for celebrating mass. This meant that one purpose-built chapel would be unable to serve all faiths at Magilligan. The induction classroom on H-block 3 was used each Sunday for the Free Presbyterian service and we were told that a portakabin outside was used for a combined service for other Protestants. We were later told that a classroom on H-block 1 was used for these services. Catholics held their services in a cramped portakabin at the rear of H-block 2. None of these rooms or temporary buildings was suitable for religious observance and the accommodation, which was particularly poor for Catholics, was disrespectful.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 5.29 Prisoners on Foyleview should be able to participate in the main religious services. (5.44)

**Achieved.** Prisoners from Foyleview could attend the religious service of their choice in the main prison.

## Time out of cell

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 5.30 A realistic core day should be devised and published. It should be strictly adhered to. (5.48)

**Achieved.** A new daily regime for prisoners introduced in January 2006 was generally working well, although there were some inconsistencies. There were several roll checks during the day but these were conducted efficiently and there appeared to be few delays while the roll was reconciled.

## **Additional information**

---

- 5.31 The core day, if followed punctually, allowed those prisoners allocated to activity up to nine hours 30 minutes out of their cell each day (6 hours 40 minutes on Saturdays). Prisoners on Foylview were not locked in their rooms.
- 5.32 Prisoners who were not allocated to activity were locked in their cells on weekday mornings while cleaning took place. This was supposed to take 30 minutes but prisoners said it routinely took longer and could sometimes be as much as 90 minutes on some wings. Prisoners on H-block 2 said they were often unlocked later in the mornings, particularly at weekends. Video records for a number of periods confirmed that unlocking was generally later on H-block 2 during the week and on all three H-blocks at weekends. No record of unlock times was kept and there was no management monitoring. On one day of the inspection, we found 43 prisoners locked in their cells at 10.30am, while 15 unallocated prisoners had been allowed out of their cell, which was another example of inconsistency.
- 5.33 Association took place on weekend afternoons and every evening except for Saturday. It was rarely cancelled. Prisoners told us that it was cancelled more often during the summer leave period.
- 5.34 In our survey, 55% of respondents, against a comparator of 48%, said they had exercise outside three or more times a week.

### **Further recommendation**

- 5.35 Unlock times in the main prison should be consistent between living units and should be recorded and monitored by managers.

# Section 6: Good order

## Security and rules

---

### Expected outcomes:

Security and good order are maintained through positive relationships between staff and prisoners 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 young person's risks and needs; and are clearly explained, fairly applied and routinely reviewed.

- 6.1 A senior manager should check all security information reports to ensure that they are properly analysed and followed up with appropriate action. (6.9)

**Not achieved.** The prison had accepted this recommendation and its action plan stated that 10% of security information reports (SIRs) were quality assured by a security governor. We reviewed all SIRs to date in 2006 and found that only the few with a security classification of HH had been seen by a governor. There was no evidence of general quality assurance. Only 54 SIRs had been submitted by staff to date in 2006 (see additional information below). The quality of some was poor and some had been completed many days after an incident, which was too late and often rendered the SIR ineffective. Analysis of SIRs was generally done promptly, although the quality was sometimes poor and the action taken was frequently only to place the information on file.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 6.2 Searching of staff should be consistent. (6.10)

**Not achieved.** There was an ineffective staff searching procedure and in theory, all staff were subject to a rub-down search whenever they entered the prison and all bags were x-rayed. In practice, however, staff could predict when the search team would not be present, outside peak hours, and could enter without being searched.

---

### Further recommendation

- 6.3 A risk assessment appropriate to the security category should be carried out to determine the level of searching necessary for staff and visitors entering the prison. Staff searches should be random and unpredictable.
- 

### Additional information

---

- 6.4 Very little had changed in terms of overall security. Prisoners' security classification made no difference to the conditions in which they lived. The prison held only medium or low risk prisoners but the lack of ongoing assessments of security classification meant that they finished their sentence on the same classification as when they started. Only 11 prisoners were categorised as low risk but this figure would almost certainly have been much higher if classification had been reviewed annually. This was typified by the fact that there were 78 medium risk prisoners compared to only two low risk prisoners in the low-secure semi-open

environment of Foyleview. Conversely, nine low-risk prisoners lived in the main part of the prison.

- 6.5 The security department was not well integrated. There was little proactive promotion of security issues and little evidence that staff were encouraged to engage fully with the process of dynamic security. The security department did not acknowledge SIRs or publish monthly bulletins.
- 6.6 Many of the formal intelligence systems were largely ineffective. Informal intelligence was used far more than SIRs because staff appeared unwilling to commit information in writing. This made it almost impossible to collate quality detailed intelligence and failed to provide assurances about the validity of information. The absence of any safeguards or audit trails left the system potentially open to abuse. One prisoner was spending 48 hours in the special supervision unit (SSU) following a positive indication by the passive drugs dog. He was convinced that the 'passive' search had been requested only because he had asked for extra time at adjudication to consult with a solicitor and that staff had arranged for it knowing that an indication would mean he would have to remain in the SSU rather than return to his wing while the adjudication was adjourned. Staff said the search had taken place following specific intelligence that the prisoner was carrying drugs but no SIR had been submitted and no one was able to provide us with specific details of any intelligence received that had led to the search.

#### **Further recommendations**

- 6.7 All prisoners should have their security classification level assessed and reviewed at least annually.
- 6.8 The security department should be better integrated into the rest of the prison and a monthly security bulletin accessible to all staff should be published.
- 6.9 All staff should be encouraged to submit security information reports promptly following receipt of intelligence.
- 6.10 Any specific intelligence received against a prisoner should be written up and evaluated before action is taken.
- 6.11 All security information reports should be acknowledged by the security department.

## **Discipline**

---

### **Expected outcomes:**

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

### **Disciplinary procedures**

---

- 6.12 Prisoners found guilty of charges in adjudication hearings should not be routinely downgraded under the progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme (PREPS). (6.23)

**Not achieved.** Prisoners' regimes were routinely downgraded following adjudications without formal review and the prisoner did not have the opportunity to participate in the process. The official paperwork stated that downgrading should occur only after a serious disciplinary offence but we found numerous examples of prisoners being downgraded following relatively trivial offences, sometimes having received only a suspended punishment. This caused considerable discontent among prisoners.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

### **Additional information**

---

- 6.13** There had been 334 adjudications in 2005 and 209 to date in 2006. The increase in the rate was partly due to the extremely disruptive behaviour of five prisoners who had recently been transferred to Maghaberry. A number of recent adjudications had not been proceeded with due to the prisoner being discharged at the end of his sentence or transferring. Adjudication procedures were extremely formal and prisoners often sought a judicial review if they chose to appeal against a decision. The prison had recently started to carry out some trend analysis of adjudications, which had highlighted a worrying religious imbalance: Catholic prisoners accounted for 69% of all charges (despite representing only 46% of all prisoners) while Protestants accounted for only 27%.
- 6.14** Punishment tariffs had recently been introduced, although standardisation meetings did not take place and there was an over-emphasis on the use of cellular confinement as a punishment. Cellular confinement was the default punishment for offences including refusing to work, disobeying an order or having any unauthorised article in possession. It had been routinely issued as a punishment in over 75% of all adjudications in 2006 and this was often disproportionate to the offence. The completed records for 2006 of cases that had resulted in a guilty verdict showed that cellular confinement had been awarded 102 times.
- 6.15** In the majority of cases, cellular confinement automatically resulted in the loss of all privileges. This included access to telephones, reading material and tobacco, even though the tariff guidance stated that tobacco should not normally be removed as part of this punishment. We were told that prisoners could apply to have their punishments remitted and such requests were considered sensitively. However, SSU staff were clear that cellular confinement meant that no privileges were issued. The adjudication punishment pro-forma also indicated that cellular confinement would involve loss of all privileges unless otherwise specified. One prisoner began a dirty protest when his tobacco was removed and stopped only when it was returned to him after a review.

#### **Further recommendations**

- 6.16** The reasons for the disproportionate number of Catholic prisoners placed on report should be investigated and efforts made to address the imbalance.
- 6.17** Cellular confinement should not routinely be given as a punishment in cases where prisoners have not used or threatened violence.
- 6.18** The punishment of cellular confinement should not routinely include the loss of all privileges unless specifically decided in exceptional circumstances by the adjudicating governor.
- 6.19** Standardisation meetings should be held regularly between adjudicating governors.

- 
- 6.20 The governor should review a random sample of completed adjudications every month to ensure that tariff guidance, including that on loss of privileges, is being followed by adjudicating governors.
- 

### **Special supervision unit**

---

- 6.21 Prisoners on cellular confinement should have access to reading material other than a bible. (6.24)

**Not achieved.** See paragraph 6.15.

- 6.22 Prisoners should not be held in the special supervision unit (SSU) on the sole basis of an indication by the drug dog. (6.25)

**Not achieved.** Prisoners were still located in the SSU for 48 hours following a positive indication by the passive drugs dog. The prison had rejected this recommendation but had not undertaken any form of analysis to determine what the policy was intended to achieve or how it fitted in with its supply reduction strategy. SSU staff suggested that it gave prisoners the opportunity to hand over any illicit contraband they might have in their possession. No one could recall this ever happening and the records of drug finds showed that no contraband had been recovered in this way.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

### **Additional information**

---

- 6.23 The SSU consisted of 18 cells, two of which were used as storerooms and one of which was out of action. There was one observation cell. Four prisoners were located there on the day we inspected. Two were on cellular confinement, and one was located there for 48 hours following a positive indication by the passive drugs dog (see paragraph 6.6). The other was a foreign national immigration detainee with mental health issues who had been there for over 12 months.
- 6.24 The SSU was an old building and was entirely unsuitable. Only half the cells had electricity and these were used for prisoners awaiting adjudication or who were located following a positive indication by the passive drugs dog. None of the cells had plumbing and the furniture was extremely sparse. The unit itself was scruffy and dingy and the recesses were dirty. Control and restraint equipment was left lying around. Some staff wore boiler suits, which was reminiscent of the former specialist search team and was perceived by prisoners as intimidating. SSU staff we spoke to said they had worked in the unit for a long time, although we were told that a rotation policy was operated. There was no staff selection policy.
- 6.25 The cell that was out of commission following an incident over two weeks earlier had not been cleaned, despite the fact that the walls and floor were covered in human waste and food, presenting a clear health and safety risk. There was no protocol for clearing up following a dirty protest. One prisoner who staged a short dirty protest during the inspection (see paragraph 6.15) simply cleaned up the cell himself without specialist cleaning materials or input from professional cleaners. This was a health hazard for staff in the unit and prisoners who would later use the cell.
- 6.26 The SSU provided a very basic regime involving only time in the open air and the use of the telephone and shower. The emphasis and general approach was largely punitive. We heard it

being referred to as the 'punishment unit'. There was little staff interaction with prisoners and no records were kept for most prisoners during their time in the unit. All prisoners were routinely strip-searched without risk assessment on entry to the unit. Those attending for an adjudication were given a rub-down search but were strip-searched if subsequently given a punishment of cellular confinement.

---

#### **Further recommendations**

- 6.27 All staff working in the special supervision unit should be specifically chosen by the governor based on their suitability to work in such a demanding environment. Staff selection criteria should be published and a formal rotation policy implemented.
- 6.28 A more progressive regime should be introduced in the special supervision unit. Access to education and the gym should be provided subject to risk assessment.
- 6.29 Control and restraint equipment should be stored properly.
- 6.30 Staff working in the special supervision unit should not wear boiler suits.
- 6.31 A protocol for dealing safely with the aftermath of a dirty protest should be introduced.

---

#### **Use of force and special accommodation**

- 6.32 Use of force levels were relatively low but the number of incidents had increased considerably since the last inspection and was now about three times the level in 2004. Force had been used 27 times in the six months before the inspection. Of these, 20 had involved the use of control and restraint and seven had involved a prisoner being handcuffed or close-escorted to the SSU. There was no formal analysis of trends but our informal analysis indicated that a high proportion of incidents took place in the SSU.
- 6.33 The quality of the use of force paperwork completed after incidents was generally poor and often did not indicate which officers had been involved. Some documentation had been filed with missing reports, and the required forms had not been completed for around 30% of all the incidents from the previous six months, some of which were several weeks old. Many of the filed reports from spontaneous incidents contained no paperwork from the staff who initiated the incident. It was therefore not possible to determine that the force used had been appropriate and legitimate. Although we were told that all the reports were checked subsequently, no effective quality assurance was taking place and the forms were often not signed by a governor. No unique log numbers were given to completed forms, which meant that the originals could have been removed without anyone knowing. Planned interventions were not videoed and duty governors did not attend all planned cell removals.
- 6.34 One prisoner complained to us that he had been assaulted by members of the search and standby team from Maghaberry who had been temporarily deployed at Magilligan. He was heavily bruised and this had been noted by the doctor. The incident occurred when he had self-harmed by cutting himself and had refused a place on the healthcare centre because he did not wish to be located with sex offenders. Although he had requested to go to the SSU, he was removed there by force, which was when the alleged assault took place. There was only one use of force form completed by the SSU senior officer but no accounts from the other officers involved. Although there was a clear and documented act of self-harm, no PAR 1 had been

opened. It was not clear what was done to investigate these allegations in the absence of important documentation.

- 6.35 No injury to inmate forms (IMR 12s) were filed with use of force paperwork. We reviewed 10% of all IMR 12s from 2006. Forty per cent of these had been opened following control and restraint incidents but no monitoring was taking place.
- 6.36 Cell 6 in the SSU was known locally as the observation cell. We were told that it was primarily used for violent prisoners or less frequently for those at risk of self-harm and that prisoners located there were usually placed in strip conditions and monitored every 15 minutes. As defined by the security manual, this was in effect special accommodation. However, none of the safeguards required with the use of designated special accommodation were in place, such as a governor's authorisation, medical clearance and the use of special accommodation observation paperwork. The glass observation panel was broken.

#### Further recommendations

- 6.37 Every member of staff involved in use of force incidents should complete the relevant paperwork immediately after the incident and before they go off duty that day.
- 6.38 The high proportion of use of force incidents occurring in the special supervision unit should be investigated.
- 6.39 Cell 6 in the special supervision unit should be formally designated as special accommodation with a protocol specifying how it is to be used, and the formal procedures for the use of special accommodation followed.
- 6.40 Duty governors should attend all planned cell removals.
- 6.41 Planned interventions should be video recorded.

#### Housekeeping point

- 6.42 The glass observation panel in cell 6 should be repaired.

## Progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme

---

#### 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.

- 6.43 The progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme policy should be reviewed annually. Its expectations for staff should be explicit and supported by a full set of documentation. (6.34)

**Achieved.** The progressive regimes and earned privileges (PREP) scheme document had been reviewed. The findings of the evaluation report were due to be presented to the NIPS board shortly after the inspection.

**6.44 Voluntary drugs testing should be separate from PREPS. (6.35)**

**Not achieved.** The prison rejected this recommendation and prisoners were still demoted from enhanced to standard level for a single voluntary drugs test failure (see section on substance use).

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**6.45 Prisoner progression on the scheme should be automatic once they have reached the appropriate level of behaviour. (6.36)**

**Partially achieved.** Prisoners still complained that staff were inconsistent in their application of the system and that how quickly they progressed depended on their wing and who wrote their reports. Prisoners on H-block 2 were particularly unhappy about this. We could not verify these complaints but there were some delays in prisoners progressing to the next level after achieving the required number of favourable reports. There were no delays in demoting prisoners who had transgressed.

**Further recommendations**

**6.46** Residential managers should ensure that the progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme is applied consistently across all residential units.

**6.47** Prisoners who achieve the required number of positive reports should have their case reviewed for progress to the next regime level without delay.

**6.48 Prisoners should not be demoted automatically as a consequence of a single act. (6.37)**

**Not achieved.** Some prisoners were still automatically downgraded for single offences such as a voluntary drugs test failure or an adjudication for a relatively trivial offence (see section on disciplinary procedures). Almost every prisoner on basic level had been demoted following a single incident.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**6.49 There should be a central register of appeal indicating the reason for the appeal and the outcome. (6.38)**

**Achieved.** A central register was now kept.

**Additional information**

---

**6.50** The current system was under review following a consultation exercise. The basic principles of the existing scheme were working reasonably effectively. Staff and prisoners were fully aware of how the scheme operated and there were sufficient differentials between the levels to encourage prisoners to engage with the process. It was, however, operated very strictly and rigidly, particularly when it came to demoting prisoners.

**6.51** At the last inspection, we highlighted an imbalance between the number of Catholic and Protestant prisoners at the different regime levels. Some of the imbalances at enhanced level had reduced but Catholic prisoners were still over-represented on basic level.

### Further recommendation

- 6.52 The revised progressive regimes and earned privileges policy being considered by the Northern Ireland Prison Service should incorporate an action plan to address the over-representation of Catholic prisoners on basic regime.

# Section 7: Services

## Catering

---

Expected outcomes:

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

**7.1 The 16-hour gap between meals at the weekend should be reduced. (7.8)**

**Not achieved.** Although some light snacks were provided between meals, the gap between meals was unchanged and was too long.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**7.2 The serving of food should conform to relevant food safety and hygiene requirements. (7.9)**

**Partially achieved.** Trolleys were no longer held waiting outside H-blocks and were quickly connected to a power supply while waiting to be unloaded. Staff checked the temperature every day and recorded it accurately. Prisoners serving the food had been trained in food handling and hygiene and all had achieved a relevant qualification. However, not all servery orderlies wore hats or white jackets when serving food and we saw two in singlets with only a disposable apron.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**7.3 Staff should supervise the serving of food effectively and be models of good practice to prisoner kitchen workers. (7.10)**

**Achieved.** An officer directly supervised serving to ensure that only reasonable portions of the chosen meal were served. This meant that all prisoners were served before any surplus food was distributed and that this was done fairly. A second officer supervised the queue and dining area.

**7.4 Prisoners in Foyleview should have more opportunities to self-cater as part of their preparation for release. (7.11)**

**Not achieved.** Prisoners on Foyleview were not allowed to cook their own meals other than to use toasters and microwaves. A six-week nutrition course called Action Zone 'Cook it' had been introduced for Foyleview prisoners. This trained prisoners in preparing and cooking meals under supervision but we were told that it was too risky to allow them unsupervised access to knives. We were not shown any risk assessment that would support such a restriction on this trusted group of prisoners.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

### **Additional information**

---

**7.5** Prisoners in our groups spoke well of the food. This was reflected in our survey, where just over half, significantly better than the comparator of 39% and the 2004 response of 35%, said the food was good or very good.

- 7.6 Prisoners told us that the same menu cycle was repeated every three weeks and that they were committed to their choice throughout their stay. The prison's action plan suggested that the choice was made every week, yet we were given a three-weekly menu choice form that was issued each cycle to prisoners. There was evidence that prisoners could alter their choices within the three-week cycle and that staff notified the actual meal list the night before. The catering manager confirmed that the same three-weekly menu was maintained throughout.
- 7.7 Following a housekeeping point in our last report, the prison had introduced a food comments book for each servery. These were rarely used, particularly since they had been kept in the office when food was not being served. This decision had been taken after personal comments had been written about an officer, who had then used inappropriate language in her reply. The comments book we looked at had no entries since October 2005 and there had been no response to any of the comments made before that. There was no other regular consultation with prisoner representatives.
- 7.8 On Saturdays, lunch was served at midday but prisoners then had their last meal of the day before 4pm. This did not leave enough time between the two meals and left too long a period before breakfast the following day.

#### Further recommendations

- 7.9 Prisoners should be able to choose meals from a varied menu each week.
- 7.10 There should be regular consultation with prisoner representatives about food.
- 7.11 The evening meal should not be served before 5pm.

## Prison shop

---

#### Expected outcomes:

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

- 7.12 There should be a formal process of prisoner consultation for feedback and suggestions for improvement in the tuck shop. (7.22)

**Achieved.** There had been a survey of 70 prisoners and nearly two-thirds had responded. Some changes had been implemented as a result.

#### Additional information

---

- 7.13 There was no consultative committee where prisoner representatives could put forward suggestions for the tuck shop list. Prisoner satisfaction had fallen from nearly half of prisoners surveyed in 2004 saying the range of goods met their needs to just 39% at this inspection. This was significantly lower than the comparator of 46%.
- 7.14 Goods were relatively cheap and only 10% was added for handling non-VAT goods (5% for tobacco and other goods liable to VAT).

---

**Further recommendation**

**7.15** Prisoner representatives should be regularly consulted about the tuck shop.

---



# Section 8: Resettlement

## Sentence and custody planning

---

### Expected outcomes:

All prisoners have a sentence or training plan based upon an individual assessment of risks and needs, regularly reviewed and implemented throughout and after their time in custody. Prisoners, together with all relevant staff, are involved with drawing up and reviewing plans.

- 8.1 The resettlement plans of all prisoners should be reviewed at predetermined intervals throughout their sentence. (8.11)

**Achieved.** Examination of six randomly-selected files showed that planned reviews had taken place at least once. These reviews were scheduled at six-monthly intervals. The files on prisoners who had been in Magilligan for longer than six months also had subsequent reviews completed.

- 8.2 Resettlement plan targets should be prioritised, implemented and monitored and continually reviewed; identified staff should be responsible for ensuring that agreed targets are achieved. (8.12)

**Partially achieved.** While reviews were completed, it was not clear that targets were prioritised or staff responsible for ensuring their achievement identified. Reviews of plans were usually undertaken by any officer who was available when the resettlement senior officer requested them. Prisoners said that their updates were often undertaken by officers who did not know them and that the exercise was one of token compliance, often confused and duplicated with their weekly/monthly progressive regimes and earned privileges reports. Quality assurance of reviews was overseen by the resettlement senior officer who had to fulfil other duties and therefore had a considerable task to ensure reviews were kept up to date. He and the prisoner development unit senior officer were clearly committed to this work and had managed to maintain momentum. It was intended that the introduction of the PRISM IT system in 2007 would allow personal officers to take responsibility for maintaining and reviewing resettlement plans.

### Further recommendations

- 8.3 Magilligan's internal audit arrangements should routinely sample and analyse the resettlement planning processes.
- 8.4 Specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely (SMART) resettlement plan targets should be prioritised and regularly reviewed by staff familiar with the prisoner.

## Offending behaviour programmes

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 8.5 Gaps in the current tutor pool for offending behaviour programmes should be filled and a system of succession planning introduced to ensure a constant supply of trained tutors. (8.23)**

**Achieved.** In recognition of the fact that the logistics of programme delivery would always be difficult, and that facilitators were always likely to be in short supply, the NIPS had begun a review of facilitators.

- 8.6** An additional three psychologists and four counsellors from the Northlands Centre had been recruited, while a probation officer and a NIACRO worker continued to fill dedicated resettlement and OBP delivery roles. Succession planning had started, albeit tenuously, by training one officer from the induction landing in programme delivery. Although the size of the pool of officer tutors had not changed, the additional resources and better deployment meant that 79 programmes were planned for 2006-07 compared to eight delivered in 2001.

- 8.7 The size of the existing backlog for programme places should be quantified and a realistic plan implemented to manage it and meet future demand. (8.24)**

**Achieved.** The resettlement and prisoner development unit senior officers had developed a sophisticated database. This provided a clear picture of programme needs that was constantly updated and enabled them to respond to variables that could affect programme demand. This information showed that 83% of programme needs, against a target of 70%, were being met in April 2006. There were, however, some acknowledged gaps in provision, including interventions for those maintaining their innocence of sex offences and an alternatives to violence programme.

- 8.8 The choice of offending behaviour programmes and the number of places available should meet the needs of the prisoner population. (8.25)**

**Partially achieved.** This recommendation had been accepted by the NIPS but the action plan deemed it 'not achievable'. Thirteen programmes were available but the valid eligibility criteria frequently meant that prisoners could not participate. This was particularly true for sex offender treatment programmes, with only 15 of the 85 sex offenders held referred to the sex offender treatment programme in March 2006. An improved policy for the transfer of prisoners between Maghaberry and Magilligan could improve levels of participation in programmes.

- 8.9** It was difficult for the NIPS to optimise programme participation within a small estate but there was little flexibility to ensure that the optimum number of prisoners could benefit from programme availability. For example, no lifers were currently held at Magilligan and there were sex offenders at Maghaberry who might benefit from the programmes at Magilligan. We were told that a security classification exercise under way at the time of the inspection was expected to reduce many security ratings and allow more transfers.

---

#### **Further recommendations**

- 8.10** An alternatives to violence programme should be developed.
- 8.11** The reasons why a high proportion of sex offenders maintained their innocence preventing their participation in the sex offender treatment programme should be explored and a more supportive regime developed to encourage them to address offending behaviour.
- 8.12** The Northern Ireland Prison Service policy for transfers between Maghaberry and Magilligan should be reviewed and, in conjunction with the reclassification exercise, should aim to

enhance the opportunities for programme referral and participation, including allowing life-sentenced prisoners to progress to Magilligan.

- 8.13 The Northern Ireland Prison Service facilitators review should incorporate an analysis of programme needs among prisoners and prioritise resource deployment accordingly.

- 8.14 The Prison Service of England and Wales should reinstate training for OBP delivery for the Northern Ireland Prison Service. (8.26)

**Achieved.** Accredited sex offender treatment programme training had taken place at the beginning of 2006, although it was not delivered by the England and Wales Prison Service. The University of Leicester had also been commissioned to undertake independent research into programme effectiveness commencing in May 2006.

## Reintegration planning

---

### Expected outcomes:

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.

- 8.15 All prisoners should be subject to effective resettlement planning to make the best use of their time in custody and to prepare for release. (8.37)

**Partially achieved.** The prison had reduced the threshold for resettlement plan preparation from six months to 28 days to serve in Magilligan. Those serving less than 28 days were screened for basic needs through induction and pre-release programmes. The arrangements for resettlement planning offered prisoners an opportunity to participate actively in preparation of their initial plan with an interdisciplinary group of staff. This provided a good structure for resettlement planning. Yet the survey, group and individual interviews all clearly showed that prisoners did not yet experience resettlement as a meaningful concept (see main recommendation HP54 and paragraph 8.2).

- 8.16 Prisoners should be offered help to develop links with voluntary and statutory agencies in the community to provide them with support on release. (8.38)

**Achieved.** Forty-six community-based organisations came into Magilligan to offer bridging links with prisoners. The Probation Board for Northern Ireland (PBNI), NIACRO and Northlands had permanent offices in the prisoner development unit, and prisoners confirmed that they were offered support by these organisations.

- 8.17 The selection procedure for Foyleview should be reviewed to ensure that the decision making process is transparent and accountable and that the unit does not carry vacant places unnecessarily. (8.39)

**Partially achieved.** The Foyleview selection procedure had been reviewed in May 2005 and there were exceptional procedures to facilitate the transfer of first-time prisoners to the unit. The number of places had increased to 82. The Foyleview board met about once a month. It interviewed applicants and provided written feedback to those who were unsuccessful. Prisoners had the right of appeal.

- 8.18 The data showed, however, that significantly fewer Catholic than Protestant prisoners had been held in the unit since June 2005, even though there were more Catholic prisoners in the prison overall during most of this time. Prison managers suggested that Catholic prisoners were not applying for places and the Catholic priest had been asked to encourage them to do so. There was no evidence of active discrimination but not enough was being done to respond to an ongoing problem of inequality.

---

**Further recommendation**

- 8.19 Magilligan management should take active steps to address the inequality in the balance of Foyleview's population. Foyleview applications and outcomes should be subject to routine internal audit, leading to demonstrable remedial action where necessary.

- 8.20 **The rules on movement of prisoners between the main prison and the less secure area should be reviewed. (8.40)**

**Achieved.** Prisoners from Foyleview now had easier access to the main prison.

- 8.21 **All eligible prisoners should be granted a period of home leave as part of their staged preparation for release, except where risk prevents this. (8.41)**

**Partially achieved.** Fifty-six per cent (339 out of 601) of home leave applications between November 2005 and May 2006 had been granted compared to 21% in 2004 (excluding Foyleview applications). Eligibility criteria were clearly laid out. Some prisoners were unhappy that their risk classification precluded home leave being granted, especially if they had previously made successful applications in Maghaberry. We were told that this was probably due to the dynamic aspects of risk, which meant that changes in circumstances (such as failure to comply with previous home leave requirements or failure to undertake offending programmes) led to increased risk. There was no standard risk assessment used by NIPS establishments and prisoners did not receive clear explanations about reasons for refusal of their home leave applications.

- 8.22 The status of some restricted transferees (14 in Magilligan at the time of the inspection) was unclear in relation to earliest date of release calculation and eligibility for home leave. This issue caused confusion and anxiety for prisoners and their families, and appeared to be arbitrary depending on the sending prison.

---

**Further recommendations**

- 8.23 The Northern Ireland Prison Service should ensure consistency of risk assessment between its establishments.
- 8.24 Prisoners should receive clear explanations about reasons for refusal of their home leave applications.
- 8.25 The Northern Ireland Prison Service should agree with the Home Office a standard arrangement to clarify which jurisdiction has authority for restricted transferees in respect of their earliest date of release and home leave eligibility calculations.
-

## 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.

- 8.26 A local public protection policy should be developed that ensures effective arrangements to assess and manage the risks presented to the public by prisoners during their sentence and after release. (8.47)

**Achieved.** Magilligan's public protection arrangements operated within the multi-agency sex offender risk assessment management (MASRAM) framework. We were told that governors had undergone training and become more engaged in the public protection process following the 2005 MASRAM inspection. MASRAM covered only sex offenders, but was due to be extended to include violent, non-sexual offenders probably in 2007. The fact that there had been only one request from a victim for information about a home leave decision suggested limited public awareness of the victim information scheme.

### Further recommendation

- 8.27 The victim information scheme should be readvertised to increase involvement.

- 8.28 Strict clearance procedures should be introduced to ensure that prisoners identified as high risk of harming others do not have unauthorised access to actual or potential victims. (8.48)

**Achieved.** Magilligan's child protection policy, introduced in March 2006, addressed home leave and visiting arrangements. The Probation Board of Northern Ireland also held formal monthly meetings with prison visits staff to ensure, among other things, that unauthorised access to children was prevented. Access outside the prison was assessed by the home leave and work allocation boards. The decision-making panels strictly interpreted the information provided in order to protect potential victims.

## 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 the establishment.

- 8.29 A drug-free residential area should be introduced. (8.68)

**Achieved.** Two wings on H-block 1 had been designated 'drug free'. Prisoners applied for a place and could move there following a negative drug test. They signed a compact agreeing to abide by the rules of the wing and comply with drug testing. All prisoners on the drug-free wings were subject to random drug testing and anyone testing positive without mitigating circumstances (such as prescribed medication) was moved to another H-block. They could

reapply to return to the unit at a later date. All vacated cells were cleared, repainted and searched by active drugs dogs before being reallocated.

**8.30 There should be a full review of the voluntary drug testing (VDT) programme and its role and function. (8.69)**

**Not achieved.** Although samples were now sent for accredited laboratory testing, the testing programme itself had not undergone a full review. Drug testing was actually compliance testing and there was no mandatory testing. Testing was carried out only on prisoners on the drug-free wings, prisoners who were on enhanced status and those applying to move from standard to enhanced status. In the first three months of 2006, 368 tests had been completed resulting in 41 positives. There was no analysis of the results.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**8.31 A drug supply reduction strategy should be developed based on the drug strategy unit's *Drug reduction supply - good practice guide*. (8.70)**

**Not achieved.** The current drug strategy was dated 2001. A new strategy had been compiled by the regional drugs advisor and healthcare staff. This was out for consultation but there was no publication date.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**Additional information**

---

**8.32** Northlands drug and alcohol team provided drugs education and awareness programmes. The team consisted of four counsellors and an administrator employed by Northlands and three prison officer facilitators. A member of the team saw all new prisoners as part of the induction programme. Prisoners were also seen individually by a member of the team within the following two weeks as part of the resettlement board. The team took self-referrals as well as referrals from probation and other prison staff.

**8.33** Each of the team's clients had a comprehensive drug and alcohol assessment and was then identified for relevant courses, such as alcohol awareness, drug education awareness or one-to-one counselling as appropriate. However, they were not put on a course until they agreed with their Northlands counsellor that they were able to undertake it, and it was therefore difficult to ascertain how long the waiting lists for the various courses actually were.

**8.34** Northlands counsellors undertook some impressive family contact work and had just obtained a room next to the visitors' centre for joint family drug work. Staff could also refer clients to drug services in Northern Ireland and had also successfully referred clients to services in Newcastle and Manchester in England on release. In our survey, 43% of respondents, against a comparator of 36%, said they thought the drug and alcohol programmes at Magilligan would help them on release.

**8.35** Untrained officers were often detailed to drug testing duties. Testing took place only from Monday to Friday and for two hours each morning and one hour in the afternoon. Prisoners waiting for testing were held in a cell in the segregation unit, which was completely unsuitable.

**8.36** A local drug strategy meeting was held monthly. From the minutes we saw, attendance was poor.

#### **Further recommendations**

- 8.37 It should be made clear that drug testing as it is currently arranged is compliance testing and not voluntary testing.
- 8.38 Voluntary drug testing should be available for all prisoners.
- 8.39 Drug testing should be carried out seven days a week.
- 8.40 All staff carrying out drug testing should have the necessary training and competencies.
- 8.41 The room used to hold prisoners awaiting a drug test should be fit for purpose.



## Section 9: Management of human resources

- 9.1 The 2004 Magilligan inspection report included a section on the management of human resources to incorporate the Criminal Justice Inspectorate of Northern Ireland's 'common core framework of :
- openness and accountability;
  - partnership with other agencies;
  - promotion of equality and human rights;
  - seeking feedback and managing change well;
  - delivering results in relation to government objectives.
- 9.2 The 2004 inspection in relation to human resource management was followed up with a number of interviews in the prison in June and July 2006. Papers were submitted by the prison providing evidence on developments since that report, and on the current composition of the workforce.
- 9.3 There had been distinct progress since the last inspection in September 2004 and the trend continued to be positive, though there were still obstacles and uncertainties to be surmounted and the position of management still needed to be strengthened.
- 9.4 At the time of the last inspection relations with the Prison Officers' Association (POA) were particularly difficult because officers had been upset by the Prison Service's handling of the security issue and by the pension aspect of their most recent pay settlement. As a result there had been a number of protest actions, including the orchestrated mass absenteeism known as the 'blue flu'.
- 9.5 Inspectors found that these disputes had been resolved and that industrial relations were as a result somewhat easier. Officers had largely got over their security concerns and (with very few exceptions) were now willing to share their personal information with the Prison Service. They had received a pay settlement of 2% in the current year, which compared favourably with England and Wales. At Prison Service HQ level the mood was more positive than it had been: there were the beginnings of a dialogue with the POA about the future shape of the Service, as the inspection report had recommended. A new appraisal system had been introduced for senior officers and above, which the officers concerned told inspectors was a great improvement.
- 9.6 At local level, too, there had been an improvement in relations, reflecting the improvement at regional level. The Magilligan POA branch described things as 'going along quite well'. They welcomed the approach taken by the new top management of the Prison Service, describing it as a great improvement on what had gone before. As a result management had been able to agree with the POA staffing levels for the proposed new RTU accommodation unit and work patterns to apply over the summer period. Night duty officers had successfully been introduced, and they were now up to the complement of 46. The use of overtime had been reduced as a result, from over 2000 hours a month to 1116.
- 9.7 However, management was still constrained by a fear that there could be a reversion to industrial action at any time. A minor dispute had occurred recently which illustrated the danger: neither party had handled the incident well. Although the governing Governor said he

enjoyed good working relations with the POA leadership, other governors said that there was still scope for practical improvement. With some remaining mutual distrust and lack of respect there was a way to go before the relationship would be fully satisfactory. New appointments which were planned could provide the opportunity for a fresh start.

- 9.8 Whether because of actual opposition from the POA or because management had not thought it wise to put them to the test, there had been limited progress on the majority of the human resources issues noted in the 2004 report. Human resource issues were described to inspectors as '... still the biggest hurdle in the Prison Service. We are constantly working round it'. Management continued to be hesitant about proceeding without the agreement of the trade union side, in part because of the effort required to conduct disputes procedures in Northern Ireland but also because it did not want to jeopardise the potential for progress in negotiations with the POA at the regional level.
- 9.9 A proposed new appraisal system for main grade officers had not yet been introduced, but the POA told inspectors that there was no 'failure to agree' about it: the Prison Service Management Board had decided to defer it till next year and it was an issue that would be resolved. Some work on appropriate grading of tasks had been conducted by a local implementation team, but there too nothing had happened in practice yet: officers and senior officers were still performing tasks which were inappropriate to their grade. Staffing levels and patterns of work remained essentially unchanged, though there had been some freeing up of resources: for example, the dedicated 'stand-by reaction force' had been disbanded and reassigned to front-line work.
- 9.10 The POA maintained that higher staff/prisoner ratios were required in Northern Ireland because all the prisoners (not just the separated prisoners) represented a special level of threat, whereas a recent internal study has shown that in fact the average level of threat is if anything *lower* in Northern Ireland prisons than in England and Wales.
- 9.11 A human resource strategy for Magilligan had been developed and a training needs analysis had been completed, but in both cases there had been limited follow-through in terms of practical implementation. No survey had been conducted to establish the views and concerns of staff, as had been recommended: however, the Management Board was working up proposals which it expected would be launched later in the year.
- 9.12 Pressure of work was reported to be a constraint on both management and staff. The desirability of gaining wider experience through postings to other agencies had been reflected in some personal development plans, but nothing had happened because of the reported pressure of work.
- 9.13 Training and development generally, which inspectors had said in 2004 needed to be prioritised, were still not taking place on the required scale, though there had been some improvement: for instance, ten staff were now ready to assist with adult numeracy and literacy education. The POA said that they were willing to help management to free up staff for drugs training, for induction programmes and education and for whatever training was required in relation to the new RTU units.
- 9.14 Inspectors were told that it was easier to get staff to go on residential courses than locally provided courses, which suggested that much non-mandatory training was still being left too much at the discretion of staff, rather than being managed. The POA said that training needed to be more selective and specific to the area where the individual officer would be working, and it should be provided by an outside organisation if a better standard could be obtained thereby.

- 9.15 Inspectors heard that governors were tied up with large amounts of paperwork which limited the extent to which they could take initiatives or go out and meet regularly with staff and prisoners. Applications for home leave and work on resettlement had expanded; adjudications were proving very time-consuming, with numerous letters from solicitors requiring attention; and work on MASRAM (inter-agency sex offender management) was increasing rapidly. Inspectors were told that, with the introduction of the ViSOR system, such monitoring would be extended to cover 200 or more violent, as well as sexual, offenders. Requests for statistical returns were increasing, the latest being information about foreign prisoners. The number of inspection recommendations was also cited as a pressure on governors' time.
- 9.16 The Management Services Group provided some support to governors on these matters, but it is for consideration whether that secretariat should not be strengthened to take more of the paperwork off governors and free them up to focus more on their core functions. It would be important to check that any time that was freed up in such a way was used for the purpose intended: there would be little point in strengthening the support function if the pattern of work remained unchanged.
- 9.17 Sick absence had improved significantly. Only 24 officers were absent on sick leave on the day of the inspection, and half of those were on long-term sick leave. There was far less casual sick absence than previously, and worthwhile progress in getting long-term sick absence off the books. Magilligan's performance in this respect was the best in the NI Prison Service.
- 9.18 The proportion of Catholics among prison grades (where there has been no recent recruitment and very little turnover) remains low at about 11%, but other grades including the recently recruited night support officers show a better balance, making the overall ratio 20%. There is the beginning of an improving trend, and the POA emphasised, as before, that in their view there was no discrimination against Catholic officers. The gender balance among prison grades is 15% female, while for the workforce as a whole it is 22% – again on an improving trend.
- 9.19 In the short term the capacity of Magilligan was being increased with the construction of 60 new cells, which should be ready for occupation in September 2007. In the long term, however, there is a question over the location of a replacement for the establishment as a whole. Inspectors asked whether staff were unsettled by the uncertainty over the long-term future of the site. They were told that staff had been aware for many years that the prison might close at some date, and though relocation might be a problem for some locally employed staff, the majority were philosophical about it. At present the workforce remained stable, with no problems of recruitment or retention of staff. However the question clearly remains a live one in the minds of many members of staff.
- 9.20 It has been noted above that overtime hours had been reduced. There are three types of overtime in the Northern Ireland Prison Service:
- Additional Voluntary Hours, for which time off in lieu is provided;
  - Unavoidable Compulsory Hours, for which time off is allowed but which can also be paid at management's discretion;
  - Additional Emergency Hours, which represent paid overtime.
- 9.21 AEH was meant to be reserved for emergency situations, but had expanded into a significant burden of paid overtime. Nevertheless it continued to be a relatively cheap option for management, and though the POA argued for phasing out AEH management found it extremely useful to retain it so long as it was not excessive and remained affordable.

## Conclusions

---

- 9.22 Industrial relations at Magilligan were improving but were still fragile and continued to be a constraint on human resources management in the prison and thus on the development of the prison as a whole. The shortfall of training and the difficulty in optimising the deployment of officers (because of the existing duty arrangements) impacted directly on the quality of service being provided to prisoners and therefore (probably) on the likelihood of their re-offending upon release.
- 9.23 The pattern of staffing made it difficult for Magilligan to improve significantly on its current very high cost per prisoner place, though there had been an improvement in the previous year as a result of the sharp increase in the number of prisoner places from 348 in 2004 to 435 in 2006. As an illustration, 40 extra prisoners were being accommodated at Foyleview with an increase of just two members of staff at that unit. With an operating budget of £25.1 million in 2006-07, Magilligan's cost per prisoner place is now estimated to be £58,000 p.a., against £66,000 in 2004-05.
- 9.24 Headquarters had done much to improve the mood of relations with the POA, but local management had not as yet felt able to capitalise on that by pressing through changes which it knew to be necessary. Progress will require energy and determination. The POA remained extremely powerful, and though relations with management were much better than they were, the POA was still in the driving seat and could withdraw its good will at any time. Management needs to know that it will receive political support if it takes a firm line, as from time to time it will need to if the service is to be made as good and as cost-effective as it could be.
- 9.25 It is essential that governors should be freed up to spend more time on the active management of the prison. For that they might need to receive more administrative support from the Management Services Group to reduce the time they currently spend on paperwork. Officers' time needs to be freed up too, so that they can undertake more training and spend more time interacting constructively with prisoners. The recruitment of support grades will be helpful in this, but it is also essential that minimum staffing levels should be reviewed and duties should be allocated appropriately.
- 9.26 Inspectors considered whether in Magilligan's circumstances it would be desirable to introduce a central duty office, at least for a transitional period of one or two years, to establish good practice in staff duty management. However they decided that the strategic aim must be to devolve responsibility for management effectively down through all the grades, and reducing the line management responsibilities of the senior officers would conflict with that objective.
- 9.27 More generally there still needs to be a change of culture within the Prison Service. Officers need to understand – and there are encouraging signs at Magilligan that this understanding is beginning to emerge – that it is in their interests to cooperate with management, to adopt a more professional stance and to work with management to improve the service delivered to prisoners.
- 9.28 Staff need to be assured that their jobs are secure, so there is no need for them to be defensive, but they also need to understand that in the longer term the way to safeguard their security is to ensure that they are providing the standard of service which would justify their pay and grading as professionals in the criminal justice system. As things stand, even with recent improvements, they must be vulnerable to a financially pressed Legislative Assembly wanting to reduce costs by contracting functions out to the private sector.

## Progress on main recommendations

---

- 9.29 **A human resource strategy needs to be developed specifically for Magilligan, designed to ensure that posts are filled and duties allocated appropriately. (HR8)**

**Partially achieved.** A local HR strategy covering the period 2006-08 had been developed for Magilligan. There had, however, been a lack of progress in implementing it on account of opposition by the POA.

---

### Further recommendation

- 9.30 **Governors need to show a resolve to implement necessary changes in working practices, following due consultation with the POA.**

- 9.31 **A new appraisal and performance management system needs to be introduced, linking Prison Service, prison, sectional and individual objectives. (HR9)**

**Partially achieved.** A new appraisal system had been introduced for senior officers and higher grades in April 2005, and was reported to be a major improvement on the former arrangements. Extension of the system to officers had been due in April 2006 but had been postponed until April 2007 to allow for teething problems to be addressed.

---

### Further recommendation

- 9.32 **The new appraisal system should be extended to all grades of staff by April 2007.**

- 9.33 **A comprehensive training plan should be prepared on the basis of a proper training needs analysis, and training should be prioritised. (HR10)**

**Partially achieved .** A detailed local training needs analysis was undertaken in June 2005 by a manager from Maghaberry. This led to a training plan which would have been a sound basis for development. However the uptake of training continued to be less than sufficient.

---

### Further recommendation

- 9.34 **Required training identified in the needs analysis should be delivered.**

## Progress on other recommendations

---

- 9.35 **The responsibilities of the different grades need to be clarified, and duties need to be assigned to the appropriate grade. (9.13)**

**Not achieved.** A local implementation team had been looking at grading issues, but there had been no progress on the ground as yet.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 9.36 **Plans should be developed for exposing staff and managers to experience of other working environments.(9.18)**

**Partially achieved.** The idea of gaining experience in other working environments had been incorporated into governors' personal development plans, but we were told that there had been no opportunity to act upon it because of the pressure on governors' time.

#### Further recommendation

9.37 All governor grades should be given sufficient time to complete personal development objectives.

9.38 **A staff attitude survey should be conducted to assess and prioritise the issues that are of most concern to staff. (9.31)**

**Not achieved.** Management had not proposed a staff attitude survey because of the expectation that any such proposal would be rejected by the POA. We were told that the Prison Service Management Board was currently working up proposals which it expected would be launched later in the year. In view of the improvement of morale this now seemed less urgent.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

9.39 **Management needs to focus on means of direct communication with staff, reducing reliance on the Prison Officers' Association (POA) as the means of communication. (9.32)**

**Partially achieved.** There was now a functioning structure of communication through team briefings, but there was a continuing need for more face to face communication with staff.

9.40 **There needs to be a longer-term negotiation with the POA to agree a strategy for handling the gradual adjustment of the Northern Ireland Prison Service to the changing circumstances of Northern Ireland. (9.50)**

**Partially achieved.** Discussions had begun with the POA about possible restructuring of the Prison Service. The POA had submitted its own proposals for a new grading structure. The exchanges were at an early stage and it remains to be seen whether progress can be made.

# Summary of recommendations

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

## Main recommendations

### To the Director-General of the NIPS

---

- 10.1 The Northern Ireland Prison Service should develop a national strategy to promote equality and diversity, and to prevent direct and indirect discrimination in relation to race, religion, ethnicity, nationality and sexuality. This should include training for all prison staff, and a requirement for impact assessments of all policies, both within the service and in individual prison establishments. (HP44)

## Main recommendations

### To the Governor

---

- 10.2 A review of arrangements for prisoners vulnerable because of their offence should be carried out to develop a strategy to ensure that they are held in conditions that help them feel safe, have appropriate access to regime activities and are encouraged to address their offending behaviour. (HP45)
- 10.3 A more holistic approach to safety should be developed by fully incorporating the work of the suicide prevention and anti-bullying committees into the safer custody committee and involving and consulting prisoners about how to make Magilligan a safer place. (HP46)
- 10.4 A nominated senior manager should be responsible for ensuring that all use of force is fully and properly recorded by all those involved, with a unique reference number for each incident. (HP47)
- 10.5 The special supervision unit should be acknowledged as unfit for purpose and replaced urgently. (HP48)
- 10.6 All prisoners should have a named personal officer who should produce regular reports on their personal circumstances and progress and contribute to meeting their resettlement targets. (HP49)
- 10.7 The demolition of the H-blocks and their replacement with more suitable accommodation, with integral sanitation, should be prioritised. (HP50)
- 10.8 Physical security in the prison should match the security needs of the population. Electric locking should be reduced and pass keys introduced to allow managers and staff access to all areas of the prison at any time. (HP51)
- 10.9 There should be thorough analysis, by religion and ethnicity, of access to regime activities and services to monitor and ensure equality of outcome. (HP52)
- 10.10 There should be sufficient high-quality education and work for all prisoners, supported by formal agreement or contract with the educational supplier. (HP53)

- 10.11 The resettlement culture in Magilligan should extend beyond specialists and become a core function of all staff who have contact with prisoners. (HP54)

## Recommendations

To the Director-General of the NIPS

---

### **First days in custody**

---

- 10.12 Unless there are well-evidenced security considerations, prisoners should be given more notice of planned transfers. (1.6)
- 10.13 Allocations to Magilligan should be part of a planned progression to meet prisoners' needs, and should take account of sentence plan targets, closeness to home and time left to serve. (1.7)

### **Equality, race relations and foreign nationals**

---

- 10.14 Prisoners should be asked to self-identify their ethnic background on entry to prison and the information should be used to monitor and promote equality of opportunity. (3.41)

### **Applications and complaints**

---

- 10.15 The complaints system should be revised to ensure that staff dealing with complaints are trained in informal resolution, prisoners can take complaints about staff to an appropriate senior level in confidence, impartial investigations take place and replies to complaints are monitored for quality. (3.61)

### **Security and rules**

---

- 10.16 All prisoners should have their security classification level assessed and reviewed at least annually. (6.7)

### **Progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme**

---

- 10.17 The revised progressive regimes and earned privileges policy being considered by the Northern Ireland Prison Service should incorporate an action plan to address the over-representation of Catholic prisoners on basic regime. (6.52)

### **Offending behaviour programmes**

---

- 10.18 The Northern Ireland Prison Service policy for transfers between Maghaberry and Magilligan should be reviewed and, in conjunction with the reclassification exercise, should aim to enhance the opportunities for programme referral and participation, including allowing life-sentenced prisoners to progress to Magilligan. (8.12)
- 10.19 The Northern Ireland Prison Service facilitators review should incorporate an analysis of programme needs among prisoners and prioritise resource deployment accordingly. (8.13)

## **Reintegration planning**

---

- 10.20 The Northern Ireland Prison Service should ensure consistency of risk assessment between its establishments. (8.23)
- 10.21 The Northern Ireland Prison Service should agree with the Home Office a standard arrangement to clarify which jurisdiction has authority for restricted transferees in respect of their earliest date of release and home leave eligibility calculations. (8.25)

## **Public protection**

---

- 10.22 The victim information scheme should be readvertised to increase involvement. (8.27)

## **Recommendations**

To the Director General of IND

---

- 10.23 Immigration detainees should not be held in prison after the end of their sentence. (3.42)

## **Recommendations**

To the Governor

---

## **First days in custody**

---

- 10.24 Prisoners should not routinely travel handcuffed in secure vehicles unless individual assessments demonstrate a high level of risk. (1.2)
- 10.25 The location of vulnerable prisoners with others on the induction wing should be fully risk-assessed. (1.17)
- 10.26 Prisoners arriving at Magilligan should be allowed a free telephone call to inform family and friends of their whereabouts. (1.18)

## **Accommodation and facilities**

---

- 10.27 Internal gates in residential units should be unlocked during the core day to allow greater freedom of movement. (2.8)
- 10.28 Broken association equipment should be replaced. (2.9)
- 10.29 The number of beds in dormitories in Sperrin House should be reduced and low-level screening installed to provide some privacy. (2.10)

## **Personal officers**

---

- 10.30 The personal officer scheme should be linked to sentence planning, and personal officers should be responsible for monitoring and chasing the completion of targets set for prisoners. (2.14)

## **Bullying**

---

- 10.31 A comprehensive and detailed policy to address bullying behaviour and to support the victim should be devised. This should be well publicised and staff and prisoners trained in its application and encouraged to use it. (3.2)

## **Suicide and self-harm**

---

- 10.32 Members of the suicide prevention team should attend meetings regularly. This team should include representatives from the education department, workshops and prisoners. (3.25)
- 10.33 PAR 1s should be monitored and analysed to identify the number of prisoners involved and any trends. (3.26)
- 10.34 PAR 1 forms should be opened in all cases when a prisoner self-harms. (3.27)
- 10.35 All incidents where prisoners have self-harmed and are placed in special accommodation or strip/protective clothing should be recorded and monitored by the safer custody committee. (3.28)
- 10.36 A senior manager should audit the quality of closed PAR 1 forms with particular emphasis on prisoners' attendance at reviews, the efforts made to contact families, where appropriate, and the quality of care plans and daily entries. (3.29)
- 10.37 The use of Listener suites should be recorded. (3.30)
- 10.38 Prisoners should have free telephone access to the Samaritans and other help lines from the landing telephones. (3.31)
- 10.39 All night guards should carry ligature knives and be trained in their use. (3.32)
- 10.40 Emergency radio codes alerting healthcare staff to the nature of any self-harm incident should be introduced. (3.33)

## **Equality, race relations and foreign nationals**

---

- 10.41 The equality and diversity manager should have a job description and should be given enough time for the work. (3.35)
- 10.42 Members of the equality and diversity committee should attend all meetings regularly. (3.36)
- 10.43 There should be a policy for dealing with foreign national prisoners, and a coordinator appointed to ensure their needs are met. (3.37)

## **Family and friends**

---

- 10.44 A formally agreed limit of mail and telephone calls should be monitored and censored. This should be adhered to. (3.43)

- 10.45 The passive drug dog should be used in conjunction with other intelligence. Collective restrictions should not be placed on a group of visitors. (3.44)
- 10.46 Seating in the visits hall should be more comfortable and conducive to a relaxed atmosphere. (3.45)
- 10.47 Family liaison officers should be supported by their managers and peers and should be given facility time to carry out their role effectively. (3.47)
- 10.48 A formal record should be kept of work undertaken by the family liaison officers. (3.48)
- 10.49 Legal correspondence opened in error should be recorded. (3.51)
- 10.50 Additional telephones should be provided on Sperrin and Foyleview. (3.52)

### **Applications and complaints**

---

- 10.51 All request/complaint forms should be centrally recorded and copies of completed cases should be centrally filed. (3.53)
- 10.52 Senior managers should quality assure replies to complaints and take action where replies are of an unsatisfactory standard. (3.59)
- 10.53 Senior managers should monitor and analyse trends in complaints over time, including subject, place, promptness and ethnicity/religion of the complainant. (3.60)

### **Healthcare**

---

- 10.54 Patients should sign to confirm receipt of in-possession medications. (4.4)
- 10.55 Prisoners should have secure lockers in which to store their medications. (4.5)
- 10.56 The pharmacy contract should be reviewed and the pharmacist should be encouraged to take a more active role in the provision of healthcare at the prison. Pharmacist-led clinics should be introduced to allow patients to discuss their medication, and to supply medicines for minor ailments. (4.6)
- 10.57 The system for issuing prescriptions should be reviewed and simplified to reduce the need for transcription and duplication and thereby reduce the risk of error. (4.7)
- 10.58 Induction medication packs should be provided so that all prisoners receive a supply of simple self-care medication, including paracetamol tablets, at the time of admission. (4.8)
- 10.59 All medications administered should be recorded on the patient's prescription and administration chart. (4.10)
- 10.60 A mental health needs assessment should be carried out to inform the development of services. (4.17)
- 10.61 Consultations with healthcare staff should be conducted in a manner similar to that in the community, with patients allowed to sit when seeing the doctor. (4.18)

- 10.62 Staff who administer vaccinations should have immunisation and vaccination training, including the treatment of anaphylaxis. (4.19)
- 10.63 A training needs analysis should be undertaken. (4.20)

### **Education and library provision**

---

- 10.64 Senior managers should use data from across the education provision as part of a coherent management information system to plan future provision. (5.5)
- 10.65 Learning plans should be used in all vocational areas. (5.7)
- 10.66 The library should be housed in better accommodation (5.8)
- 10.67 All prisoners should be able to use the library at least once a week. (5.9)
- 10.68 Prisoners on Foyleview and in the special supervision unit and patients in healthcare should have access to a full library service. (5.10)

### **Work**

---

- 10.69 Accommodation for vocational workshops should be improved. (5.16)
- 10.70 The time taken to move to activities and the long downtime over lunch should be reduced. (5.19)
- 10.71 Teaching and learning in accredited programmes should be observed. (5.20)

### **Physical education and health promotion**

---

- 10.72 Accredited programmes should be reintroduced and embedded in the physical education provision. (5.21)
- 10.73 Participation in physical education should be improved to at least 50%. (5.26)
- 10.74 The gym showers should be adequately supervised. (5.27)

### **Faith and religious activity**

---

- 10.75 Religious services should take place in a proper chapel or room dedicated for worship. (5.28)

### **Time out of cell**

---

- 10.76 Unlock times in the main prison should be consistent between living units and should be recorded and monitored by managers. (5.35)

### **Security and rules**

---

- 10.77 A senior manager should check all security information reports to ensure that they are properly analysed and followed up with appropriate action. (6.1)

- 10.78 A risk assessment appropriate to the security category should be carried out to determine the level of searching necessary for staff and visitors entering the prison. Staff searches should be random and unpredictable. (6.3)
- 10.79 The security department should be better integrated into the rest of the prison and a monthly security bulletin accessible to all staff should be published. (6.8)
- 10.80 All staff should be encouraged to submit security information reports promptly following receipt of intelligence. (6.9)
- 10.81 Any specific intelligence received against a prisoner should be written up and evaluated before action is taken. (6.10)
- 10.82 All security information reports should be acknowledged by the security department. (6.11)

### **Discipline**

---

- 10.83 Prisoners found guilty of charges in adjudication hearings should not be routinely downgraded under the progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme (PREPS). (6.12)
- 10.84 The reasons for the disproportionate number of Catholic prisoners placed on report should be investigated and efforts made to address the imbalance. (6.16)
- 10.85 Cellular confinement should not routinely be given as a punishment in cases where prisoners have not used or threatened violence. (6.17)
- 10.86 The punishment of cellular confinement should not routinely include the loss of all privileges unless specifically decided in exceptional circumstances by the adjudicating governor. (6.18)
- 10.87 Standardisation meetings should be held regularly between adjudicating governors. (6.19)
- 10.88 The governor should review a random sample of completed adjudications every month to ensure that tariff guidance, including that on loss of privileges, is being followed by adjudicating governors. (6.20)
- 10.89 Prisoners should not be held in the special supervision unit (SSU) on the sole basis of an indication by the drug dog. (6.22)
- 10.90 All staff working in the special supervision unit should be specifically chosen by the governor based on their suitability to work in such a demanding environment. Staff selection criteria should be published and a formal rotation policy implemented. (6.27)
- 10.91 A more progressive regime should be introduced in the special supervision unit. Access to education and the gym should be provided subject to risk assessment. (6.28)
- 10.92 Control and restraint equipment should be stored properly. (6.29)
- 10.93 Staff working in the special supervision unit should not wear boiler suits. (6.30)
- 10.94 A protocol for dealing safely with the aftermath of a dirty protest should be introduced. (6.31)
- 10.95 Every member of staff involved in use of force incidents should complete the relevant paperwork immediately after the incident and before they go off duty that day. (6.37)

- 10.96 The high proportion of use of force incidents occurring in the special supervision unit should be investigated. (6.38)
- 10.97 Cell 6 in the special supervision unit should be formally designated as special accommodation with a protocol specifying how it is to be used, and the formal procedures for the use of special accommodation followed. (6.39)
- 10.98 Duty governors should attend all planned cell removals. (6.40)
- 10.99 Planned interventions should be video recorded. (6.41)

### **Progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme**

---

- 10.100 Voluntary drugs testing should be separate from PREPS. (6.44)
- 10.101 Residential managers should ensure that the progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme is applied consistently across all residential units. (6.46)
- 10.102 Prisoners who achieve the required number of positive reports should have their case reviewed for progress to the next regime level without delay. (6.47)
- 10.103 Prisoners should not be demoted automatically as a consequence of a single act. (6.48)

### **Catering**

---

- 10.104 The 16-hour gap between meals at the weekend should be reduced. (7.1)
- 10.105 The serving of food should conform to relevant food safety and hygiene requirements. (7.2)
- 10.106 Prisoners in Foyleview should have more opportunities to self-cater as part of their preparation for release. (7.4)
- 10.107 Prisoners should be able to choose meals from a varied menu each week. (7.9)
- 10.108 There should be regular consultation with prisoner representatives about food. (7.10)
- 10.109 The evening meal should not be served before 5pm. (7.11)

### **Prison shop**

---

- 10.110 Prisoner representatives should be regularly consulted about the tuck shop. (7.15)

### **Sentence and custody planning**

---

- 10.111 Magilligan's internal audit arrangements should routinely sample and analyse the resettlement planning processes. (8.3)
- 10.112 Specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely (SMART) resettlement plan targets should be prioritised and regularly reviewed by staff familiar with the prisoner. (8.4)

## **Offending behaviour programmes**

---

- 10.113 An alternatives to violence programme should be developed. (8.10)
- 10.114 The reasons why a high proportion of sex offenders maintained their innocence preventing their participation in the sex offender treatment programme should be explored and a more supportive regime developed to encourage them to address offending behaviour. (8.11)

## **Reintegration planning**

---

- 10.115 Magilligan management should take active steps to address the inequality in the balance of Foyleview's population. Foyleview applications and outcomes should be subject to routine internal audit, leading to demonstrable remedial action where necessary. (8.19)
- 10.116 Prisoners should receive clear explanations about reasons for refusal of their home leave applications. (8.24)

## **Substance use**

---

- 10.117 There should be a full review of the voluntary drug testing (VDT) programme and its role and function. (8.30)
- 10.118 A drug supply reduction strategy should be developed based on the drug strategy unit's *Drug reduction supply - good practice guide*. (8.31)
- 10.119 It should be made clear that drug testing as it is currently arranged is compliance testing and not voluntary testing. (8.37)
- 10.120 Voluntary drug testing should be available for all prisoners. (8.38)
- 10.121 Drug testing should be carried out seven days a week. (8.39)
- 10.122 All staff carrying out drug testing should have the necessary training and competencies. (8.40)
- 10.123 The room used to hold prisoners awaiting a drug test should be fit for purpose. (8.41)

## **Management of human resources**

---

- 10.124 Governors need to show a resolve to implement necessary changes in working practices, following due consultation with the POA. (9.30)
- 10.125 The new appraisal system should be extended to all grades of staff by April 2007. (9.32)
- 10.126 Required training identified in the needs analysis should be delivered. (9.34)
- 10.127 The responsibilities of the different grades need to be clarified, and duties need to be assigned to the appropriate grade. (9.35)
- 10.128 All governor grades should be given sufficient time to complete personal development objectives. (9.37)

10.129 A staff attitude survey should be conducted to assess and prioritise the issues that are of most concern to staff. (9.38)

## Housekeeping point

---

### **Discipline**

---

10.130 The glass observation panel in cell 6 should be repaired. (6.42)

# Appendix 1: Inspection team

---

Anne Owers	HM Chief Inspector
Michael Loughlin	Team leader
Joss Crosbie	Inspector
Jonathan French	Inspector
Paul Fenning	Inspector
Brett Robinson	Inspector

## **Criminal Justice Inspectorate Northern Ireland**

Tom McGonigle	Inspector
---------------	-----------

## **Specialist inspector**

Elizabeth Tysoe	Healthcare
-----------------	------------

## **Researchers**

Laura Nettleingham	Research Officer
Lucy Trussler	Trainee Research Officer

## Appendix 2: Prison population profile

---

### Population breakdown by:

---

(i) Status	Number of prisoners	%
Sentenced	396	99.75
Detainees (single power status)	1	0.25
Detainees (dual power status)	nil	
Total	397	

(ii) Sentence	Number of prisoners	%
Less than 6 months	13	3.3
6 months to less than 12 months	30	7.6
12 months to less than 2 years	51	12.85
2 years to less than 4 years	89	22.4
4 years to less than 10 years	156	39.3
10 years and over (not life)	58	14.6
Life	Nil	
Total	397	

(iii) Length of stay	Number of prisoners	%
Less than 1 month	44	11.1
1 month to 3 months	66	16.7
3 months to 6 months	65	16.4
6 months to 1 year	79	19.95
1 year to 2 years	80	20.2
2 years to 4 years	47	11.9
4 years or more	15	3.8
Total	397	

---

(iv) Main offence	Number of prisoners	%
Violence against the person	75	18.9
Sexual offences	81	20.4
Burglary	23	5.8
Robbery	86	21.6
Theft & handling	11	2.8
Fraud and forgery	2	0.5
Drugs offences	33	8.3
Other offences	85	21.4
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	1	0.25
<b>Total</b>	<b>397</b>	

(v) Age	Number of prisoners	%
21 years to 29 years	152	38.3
30 years to 39 years	125	31.5
40 years to 49 years	69	17.4
50 years to 59 years	30	7.5
60 years to 69 years	15	3.8
70 plus years	5	1.26
Please state maximum age	74	
<b>Total</b>	<b>396*</b>	

\* We have one prisoner who is 20 years old.

(vi) Home address	Number of prisoners	%
Within 50 miles of the prison	133	33.5
Between 50 and 100 miles of the prison	253	63.7
Over 100 miles from the prison	3	0.75
Overseas	3	0.75
No fixed abode	5	1.26
<b>Total</b>	<b>397</b>	

(vii) Nationality	Number of prisoners	%
British	366	92.2
Foreign nationals	5	1.26
Irish	26	6.55
<b>Total</b>	<b>397</b>	

(viii) Ethnicity	Number of prisoners	%
<i>White</i>		
British	366	92.2
Irish	26	6.55
Other White	4	1.00
<i>Mixed</i>		
White and Black Caribbean		
White and Black African	1	0.25
White and Asian		
Other Mixed		
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>		
Indian		
Pakistani		
Bangladeshi		
Other Asian		
<i>Black or Black British</i>		
Caribbean		
African		
Other Black		
<i>Chinese or other ethnic group</i>		
Chinese		
Other ethnic group		
<b>Total</b>	<b>397</b>	

(ix) Religion	Number of prisoners	%
Baptist	NIL	
Church of Ireland	66	16.6
Roman Catholic	183	46.1
Other Christian denominations	125	31.5
Muslim		
Sikh		
Hindu		
Buddhist		
Jewish		
Other	5	1.3
No religion	18	4.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>397</b>	

**Breakdown of community background figures of Magilligan staff for HMCI (May 2006)**

<b>GRADES</b>	Protestant	Roman Catholic	Non-determined		Male	Female
<b>Prison grades</b>	304	44	36		327	5
<b>General service grades</b>	38	31	1		26	44
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>37</b>		<b>353</b>	<b>101</b>

# Appendix 3: Summary of prisoner questionnaires

---

## 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 the 10th may 2006 the prisoner population at Magilligan was 385. The baseline sample size was 108. Overall, this represented 28% of the prisoner population.

### Selecting the sample

---

Respondents were randomly selected from a NIPS prisoner population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. This basically means every second person is selected from a NIPS 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. Four respondents refused to complete a questionnaire.

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. In total, three respondents were 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, 90 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 23% of the prison population. The response rate was 83%. In addition to the four respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, ten 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 thirty trainer prisons since April 2003.

In addition, two further comparative documents are attached. Statistically significant differences between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group are shown in the first document and between those who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals in the second document.

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 Magilligan 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	<b>Magilligan</b>	<b>Trainer Prisons Comparator</b>
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	90	2831
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	1	1
3	Are you sentenced?	100	100
4	Is your sentence more than four years?	53	63
5	Do you have less than six months to serve?	32	27
6	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	2	7
7	Are you a foreign national?	6	12
8	Is English your first language?	99	92
9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories)	0	23
10	Have you been in prison more than five times?	13	25
11	Do you have any children?	56	58

### SECTION 2: Transfers and Escorts

12a	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)	32	48
12b	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)	57	62
12c	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)	7	16
12d	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?	25	33
12e	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)	8	13
13	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	3	11
14	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	55	70
15a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another establishment?	89	88
15b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	7	18
15c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	81	90

## Key to tables

Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons comparator	<b>Magilligan</b>	<b>Trainer Prisons Comparator</b>
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

17	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	62	53
18	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with these problems within the first 24 hours?	28	18
19a	Please answer the following question about reception: were you seen by a member of healthcare staff?	79	87
19b	Please answer the following question about reception: when you were searched, was this carried out in a sensitive and understanding way?	58	74
20	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	76	73
21a	Did you receive a reception pack on your day of arrival?	37	70
21b	Did you receive information about what was going to happen here on your day of arrival?	39	49
21c	Did you receive information about support for feeling depressed or suicidal on your day of arrival?	23	43
21d	Did you have the opportunity to have a shower on your day of arrival?	34	48
21e	Did you get the opportunity to have a free telephone call on your day of arrival?	23	46
21f	Did you get information about routine requests on your day of arrival?	40	38
21g	Did you get something to eat on your day of arrival?	90	78
21h	Did you get information about visits on your day of arrival?	44	45
22a	Did you have access to the chaplain/priest within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	17	48
22b	Did you have access to someone from healthcare within the first 24 hours?	61	73
22c	Did you have access to a Listener/Samaritans within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	10	34
22d	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	40	27
23	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	63	86
24	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	86	69
25	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	74	59

### SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody

27a	Can you get access to legal reference books?	20	57
27b	Can you get access to communication with your solicitor or legal representative?	72	72
27c	Can you get access to information about leave to appeal?	31	50
27d	Can you get access to legal visits?	66	69
27e	Can you get access to help with legal costs?	39	46
27f	Can you get access to bail information?	25	32
28a	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	78	67
28b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95	96
28c	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	93	86

## Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons comparator	<b>Magilligan</b>	<b>Trainer Prisons Comparator</b>
	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		
<b>SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody (continued)</b>			
28d	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	77	79
28e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	54	48
28f	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?	75	72
28g	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	68	37
29	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	45	39
30	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	51	39
31	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	39	46
32a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	82	86
32b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	73	91
33a	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	27	52
33b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	13	22
33c	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly?	22	50
33d	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly?	17	22
33e	Are you given information about how to make an appeal?	28	37
34	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	22	13
35	Do you know how to apply to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman?	68	51
36	Is it easy/very easy to contact the Independent Monitoring Board (BOV)?	22	46
37	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	52	56
38	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	50	56
39a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C & R)?	6	4
39b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	23	13
40a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	60	56
40b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	59	62
41	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	69	65
42a	Do you have a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	60	74
42b	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	76	80
<b>SECTION 5: Safety</b>			
44	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	54	25
46	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	30	19
47a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By prisoners)	20	11
47b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5	5

## Key to tables

Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons comparator	<b>Magilligan</b>	<b>Trainer Prisons Comparator</b>
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)

<b>47c</b>	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3	1
<b>47d</b>	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	4	4
<b>47e</b>	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	1
<b>47f</b>	Have you ever had your canteen/property taken since you have been here? (By prisoners)	4	2
<b>47g</b>	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By prisoners)	7	3
<b>47h</b>	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (by prisoners)	4	4
<b>48</b>	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	31	19
<b>49a</b>	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By staff)	26	11
<b>49b</b>	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By staff)	6	2
<b>49c</b>	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By staff)	0	0
<b>49d</b>	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	5	4
<b>49e</b>	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By staff)	1	2
<b>49f</b>	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By staff)	7	3
<b>49g</b>	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (By staff)	5	3
<b>50</b>	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	12	10

### SECTION 6: Healthcare

<b>52</b>	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	49	44
<b>53a</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the doctor is good/very good?	25	43
<b>53b</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the nurse is good/very good?	69	60
<b>53c</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dentist is good/very good?	62	33
<b>53d</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the optician is good/very good?	42	26
<b>53e</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dispensing staff/pharmacist is good/very good?	52	47
<b>54</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	36	26
<b>55a</b>	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison?	1	9
<b>55b</b>	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison?	6	6

### SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity

<b>57a</b>	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	49	36
<b>57b</b>	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	40	41
<b>57c</b>	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	52	52
<b>57d</b>	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	37	40
<b>57e</b>	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	45	36

## Key to tables

Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons comparator	<b>Magilligan</b>	<b>Trainer Prisons Comparator</b>
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 7: Purposeful Activity (continued)

<b>58</b>	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	21	52
<b>59</b>	Can you get access to a newspaper every day?	83	62
<b>60</b>	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	51	55
<b>61</b>	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	55	48
<b>62</b>	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	17	20
<b>63</b>	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekend day?(This includes hours at education, at work etc)	12	12
<b>64</b>	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	72	77
<b>65</b>	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	23	22

### SECTION 8: Resettlement

<b>67</b>	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	26	34
<b>68</b>	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	44	50
<b>69</b>	Do you have a custody/sentence plan?	50	66
<b>70</b>	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your sentence plan?	40	45
<b>71</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	33	32
<b>72</b>	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	25	21
<b>73</b>	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	57	28
<b>74</b>	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	75	74
<b>75a</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding a job on release?	48	48
<b>75b</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding accommodation on release?	54	50
<b>75c</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with your finances in preparation for release?	36	38
<b>75d</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with claiming benefits on release?	43	49
<b>75e</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	30	39
<b>75f</b>	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with external drugs courses etc	47	46
<b>75g</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with continuity of healthcare on release?	40	43
<b>76</b>	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	56	59



## Prisoner Survey Responses Magilligan 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	<b>Magilligan 2006</b>	<b>Magilligan 2004 Comparator</b>
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)

		Magilligan 2006	Magilligan 2004 Comparator
1	Number of completed questionnaires returned	90	102
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	1	1
3	Are you sentenced?	100	100
4	Is your sentence more than four years?	53	43
5	Do you have less than six months to serve?	32	43
6	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	2	3
7	Are you a foreign national?	6	4
8	Is English your first language?	99	100
9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories)	0	0
10	Have you been in prison more than five times?	13	20
11	Do you have any children?	56	62

### SECTION 2: Transfers and Escorts

		Magilligan 2006	Magilligan 2004 Comparator
12a	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)	32	36
12b	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)	57	50
12c	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)	7	12
12d	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?	25	24
12e	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)	8	11
13	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	3	2
14	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	55	67
15a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another establishment?	89	90
15b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	7	9
15c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	81	82

## Key to tables

		Magilligan 2006	Magilligan 2004 Comparator
	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the 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		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>			
17	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	62	63
18	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with these problems within the first 24 hours?	28	26
19a	Please answer the following question about reception: were you seen by a member of healthcare staff?	79	80
19b	Please answer the following question about reception: when you were searched, was this carried out in a sensitive and understanding way?	58	65
20	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	76	78
21a	Did you receive a reception pack on your day of arrival?	37	42
21b	Did you receive information about what was going to happen here on your day of arrival?	39	32
21c	Did you receive information about support for feeling depressed or suicidal on your day of arrival?	23	18
21d	Did you have the opportunity to have a shower on your day of arrival?	34	52
21e	Did you get the opportunity to have a free telephone call on your day of arrival?	23	16
21f	Did you get information about routine requests on your day of arrival?	40	37
21g	Did you get something to eat on your day of arrival?	90	84
21h	Did you get information about visits on your day of arrival?	44	31
22a	Did you have access to the chaplain/priest within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	17	16
22b	Did you have access to someone from healthcare within the first 24 hours?	61	65
22c	Did you have access to a Listener/Samaritans within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	10	20
22d	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	40	44
23	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	63	73
24	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	86	80
25	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	74	76
<b>SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody</b>			
27a	Can you get access to legal reference books?	20	18
27b	Can you get access to communication with your solicitor or legal representative?	72	75
27c	Can you get access to information about leave to appeal?	31	41
27d	Can you get access to legal visits?	66	75
27e	Can you get access to help with legal costs?	39	54
27f	Can you get access to bail information?	25	41
28a	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week	78	79
28b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day'	95	96

## Key to tables

		Magilligan 2006	Magilligan 2004 Comparator
	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the 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		
28c	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	93	94
<b>SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody (continued)</b>			
28d	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week	77	85
28e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	54	47
28f	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?	75	71
28g	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	68	66
29	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	45	47
30	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	51	35
31	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	39	46
32a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	82	53
32b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	73	60
33a	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	27	30
33b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	13	19
33c	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly?	22	30
33d	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly?	17	20
33e	Are you given information about how to make an appeal?	28	25
34	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	22	23
35	Do you know how to apply to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman?	68	28
36	Is it easy/very easy to contact the Independent Monitoring Board (BOV)?	22	30
37	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	52	55
38	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	50	55
39a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C & R)?	6	6
39b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	23	27
40a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	60	66
40b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	59	65
41	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	69	70
42a	Do you have a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	60	69
42b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	76	78
<b>SECTION 5: Safety</b>			
44	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	54	39
46	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	30	16
47a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By prisoners)	20	12

## Key to tables

		Magilligan 2006	Magilligan 2004 Comparator
	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the 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		
<b>47b</b>	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5	5
<b>SECTION 5: Safety (continued)</b>			
<b>47c</b>	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3	3
<b>47d</b>	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	4	3
<b>47e</b>	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	1
<b>47f</b>	Have you ever had your canteen/property taken since you have been here? (By prisoners)	4	2
<b>47g</b>	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By prisoners)	7	1
<b>47h</b>	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (by prisoners)	4	1
<b>48</b>	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	31	21
<b>49a</b>	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By staff)	26	15
<b>49b</b>	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By staff)	6	6
<b>49c</b>	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By staff)	0	3
<b>49d</b>	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	5	3
<b>49e</b>	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By staff)	1	3
<b>49f</b>	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By staff)	7	3
<b>49g</b>	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (By staff)	5	4
<b>50</b>	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	66	13
<b>SECTION 6: Healthcare</b>			
<b>52</b>	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	50	46
<b>53a</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the doctor is good/very good?	25	26
<b>53b</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the nurse is good/very good?	69	67
<b>53c</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dentist is good/very good?	62	77
<b>53d</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the optician is good/very good?	42	33
<b>53e</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dispensing staff/pharmacist is good/very good?	52	60
<b>54</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	36	42
<b>55a</b>	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison?	1	8
<b>55b</b>	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison?	6	10
<b>SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity</b>			
<b>57a</b>	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	49	45
<b>57b</b>	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	40	34
<b>57c</b>	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	52	43

## Key to tables

		Magilligan 2006	Magilligan 2004 Comparator
	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the 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		
<b>57d</b>	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	37	31
<b>57e</b>	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	45	27
<b>SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity (continued)</b>			
<b>58</b>	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	21	17
<b>59</b>	Can you get access to a newspaper every day?	83	77
<b>60</b>	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	51	35
<b>61</b>	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	55	68
<b>62</b>	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	17	13
<b>63</b>	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekend day?(This includes hours at education, at work etc)	12	16
<b>64</b>	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	72	79
<b>65</b>	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	23	31
<b>SECTION 8: Resettlement</b>			
<b>67</b>	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	26	42
<b>68</b>	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	44	52
<b>69</b>	Do you have a custody/sentence plan?	50	54
<b>70</b>	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your sentence plan?	40	45
<b>71</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	33	40
<b>72</b>	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	25	27
<b>73</b>	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	57	62
<b>74</b>	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	75	79
<b>75a</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding a job on release?	48	37
<b>75b</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding accommodation on release?	54	48
<b>75c</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with your finances in preparation for release?	36	38
<b>75d</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with claiming benefits on release?	43	46
<b>75e</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	30	35
<b>75f</b>	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with external drugs courses etc	47	43
<b>75g</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with continuity of healthcare on release?	40	38
<b>76</b>	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	56	62



## Prisoner Survey Responses (Vulnerable prisoners) Magilligan 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 all other prisoners comparator	Vulnerable prisoners
Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than all other prisoners comparator	All other prisoners
Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between vulnerable prisoners and all other prisoners comparator	

#### SECTION 1: General Information (not tested for significance)

1	Number of completed questionnaires returned	29	61
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0	2
3	Are you sentenced?	100	100
4	Is your sentence more than four years?	48	56
5	Do you have less than six months to serve?	19	38
6	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	3	2
7	Are you a foreign national?	7	5
8	Is English your first language?	100	98
9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories)	0	0
10	Have you been in prison more than five times?	11	15
11	Do you have any children?	31	67

#### SECTION 2: Transfers and Escorts

12a	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	25
12b	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)	71	49
12c	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)	15	4
12d	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?	31	23
12e	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)	15	5
13	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	8	2
14	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	75	46
15a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another establishment?	89	89
15b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	0	11
15c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	85	78

## Key to tables

		Vulnerable prisoners	All other prisoners
	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than all other prisoners comparator		
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than all other prisoners comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between vulnerable prisoners and all other prisoners comparator		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>			
17	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	78	54
18	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with these problems within the first 24 hours?	37	24
19a	Please answer the following question about reception: were you seen by a member of healthcare staff?	82	77
19b	Please answer the following question about reception: when you were searched, was this carried out in a sensitive and understanding way?	52	60
20	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	79	75
21a	Did you receive a reception pack on your day of arrival?	26	42
21b	Did you receive information about what was going to happen here on your day of arrival?	26	46
21c	Did you receive information about support for feeling depressed or suicidal on your day of arrival?	26	22
21d	Did you have the opportunity to have a shower on your day of arrival?	26	38
21e	Did you get the opportunity to have a free telephone call on your day of arrival?	22	24
21f	Did you get information about routine requests on your day of arrival?	30	46
21g	Did you get something to eat on your day of arrival?	82	95
21h	Did you get information about visits on your day of arrival?	30	51
22a	Did you have access to the chaplain/priest within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	18	16
22b	Did you have access to someone from healthcare within the first 24 hours?	59	62
22c	Did you have access to a Listener/Samaritans within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	8	11
22d	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	33	43
23	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	48	71
24	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	83	88
25	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	76	73
<b>SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody</b>			
27a	Can you get access to legal reference books?	4	29
27b	Can you get access to communication with your solicitor or legal representative?	69	73
27c	Can you get access to information about leave to appeal?	14	39
27d	Can you get access to legal visits?	57	71
27e	Can you get access to help with legal costs?	37	41
27f	Can you get access to bail information?	21	27
28a	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week	82	75
28b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97	95

## Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than all other prisoners comparator	Vulnerable prisoners	All other prisoners
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than all other prisoners comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between vulnerable prisoners and all other prisoners comparator		
28c	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	100	89
<b>SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody (continued)</b>			
28d	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week	78	77
28e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	56	54
28f	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?	71	76
28g	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	57	74
29	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	36	49
30	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	64	45
31	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	55	31
32a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	97	75
32b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	75	72
33a	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	32	25
33b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	21	9
33c	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly?	29	19
33d	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly?	27	11
33e	Are you given information about how to make an appeal?	30	26
34	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	17	25
35	Do you know how to apply to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman?	61	72
36	Is it easy/very easy to contact the Independent Monitoring Board (BOV)?	29	19
37	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	55	50
38	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	41	53
39a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C & R)?	3	7
39b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	3	33
40a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	64	58
40b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	52	62
41	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	82	62
42a	Do you have a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	67	56
42b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	85	72
<b>SECTION 5: Safety</b>			
44	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	69	47
46	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	45	21
47a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By prisoners)	38	11

## Key to tables

		Vulnerable prisoners	All other prisoners
	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than all other prisoners comparator		
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than all other prisoners comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between vulnerable prisoners and all other prisoners comparator		
<b>47b</b>	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By prisoners)	7	4
<b>SECTION 5: Safety (continued)</b>			
<b>47c</b>	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By prisoners)	7	0
<b>47d</b>	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	6
<b>47e</b>	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	0
<b>47f</b>	Have you ever had your canteen/property taken since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3	4
<b>47g</b>	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By prisoners)	11	6
<b>47h</b>	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (by prisoners)	0	6
<b>48</b>	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	25	34
<b>49a</b>	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By staff)	22	29
<b>49b</b>	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By staff)	3	7
<b>49c</b>	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By staff)	0	0
<b>49d</b>	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0	7
<b>49e</b>	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By staff)	0	2
<b>49f</b>	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By staff)	3	9
<b>49g</b>	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (By staff)	0	7
<b>50</b>	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	18	9
<b>SECTION 6: Healthcare</b>			
<b>52</b>	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	53	47
<b>53a</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the doctor is good/very good?	27	24
<b>53b</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the nurse is good/very good?	82	64
<b>53c</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dentist is good/very good?	70	58
<b>53d</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the optician is good/very good?	56	35
<b>53e</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dispensing staff/pharmacist is good/very good?	63	47
<b>54</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	46	32
<b>55a</b>	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison?	0	2
<b>55b</b>	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison?	8	6
<b>SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity</b>			
<b>57a</b>	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	54	46
<b>57b</b>	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	44	38
<b>57c</b>	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	55	50

## Key to tables

		Vulnerable prisoners	All other prisoners
	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than all other prisoners comparator		
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than all other prisoners comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between vulnerable prisoners and all other prisoners comparator		
<b>57d</b>	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	26	41
<b>57e</b>	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	30	51
<b>SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity (continued)</b>			
<b>58</b>	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	18	23
<b>59</b>	Can you get access to a newspaper every day?	81	84
<b>60</b>	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	34	59
<b>61</b>	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	56	55
<b>62</b>	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	24	14
<b>63</b>	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekend day?(This includes hours at education, at work etc)	19	9
<b>64</b>	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	64	75
<b>65</b>	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	22	23
<b>SECTION 8: Resettlement</b>			
<b>67</b>	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	33	23
<b>68</b>	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	57	37
<b>69</b>	Do you have a custody/sentence plan?	44	53
<b>70</b>	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your sentence plan?	26	46
<b>71</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	27	35
<b>72</b>	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	23	26
<b>73</b>	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	57	56
<b>74</b>	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	79	73
<b>75a</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding a job on release?	48	47
<b>75b</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding accommodation on release?	52	55
<b>75c</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with your finances in preparation for release?	46	31
<b>75d</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with claiming benefits on release?	44	42
<b>75e</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	28	31
<b>75f</b>	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with external drugs courses etc	40	50
<b>75g</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with continuity of healthcare on release?	37	41
<b>76</b>	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	52	57



## Key Question Responses (Wing analysis) Magilligan 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

		Foyle View	All other wings
	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the responses from all other wings		
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the responses from all other wings		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the responses from all other wings and those from Foyle View		
	Number of completed questionnaires returned	14	86
14	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	64	53
15c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	69	83
20	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	85	75
23	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	81	60
24	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	92	85
27b	Can you get access to communication with your solicitor or legal representative?	67	73
28b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100	95
28e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	40	57
30	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	43	53
31	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	15	43
33b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	0	16
37	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	93	44
38	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?		
39a	In the last 6 months have you been physically restrained?	0	7
39b	In the last 6 months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	28	22
42b	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	84	74
44	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	22	60
46	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	23	31
48	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	7	35
52	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	43	51
57a	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	57	47
57b	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	45	38
57c	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	41	53
57d	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	28	39
57e	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	36	47
58	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	15	22
60	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	72	47
61	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	64	54
62	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	38	13
63	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekend day?(This includes hours at education, at work etc)	23	10
64	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	69	73
67	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	38	24
68	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	62	40
72	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	69	17
74	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	85	73
76	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	64	54



## Prisoner Survey Responses (White Ethnic Breakdown) Magilligan 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 White British comparator	White Irish	White British
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the white British comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the White Irish and White British comparator		

### SECTION 1: General Information (not tested for significance)

Question ID	Question	White Irish	White British
1	Number of completed questionnaires returned	44	45
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	2	0
3	Are you sentenced?	100	100
4	Is your sentence more than four years?	55	51
5	Do you have less than six months to serve?	35	29
6	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	2	2
7	Are you a foreign national?	2	9
8	Is English your first language?	98	100
9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories)		
10	Have you been in prison more than five times?	11	16
11	Do you have any children?	59	53

### SECTION 2: Transfers and Escorts

Question ID	Question	White Irish	White British
12a	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)	27	38
12b	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)	50	64
12c	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)	8	7
12d	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?	21	30
12e	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)	2	14
13	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	2	4
14	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	55	56
15a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another establishment?	93	84
15b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	7	7
15c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	85	75

## Key to tables

		White Irish	White British
	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the White British comparator		
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the white British comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the White Irish and White British comparator		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>			
17	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	49	73
18	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with these problems within the first 24 hours?	28	29
19a	Please answer the following question about reception: were you seen by a member of healthcare staff?	77	80
19b	Please answer the following question about reception: when you were searched, was this carried out in a sensitive and understanding way?	61	56
20	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	77	76
21a	Did you receive a reception pack on your day of arrival?	45	29
21b	Did you receive information about what was going to happen here on your day of arrival?	43	37
21c	Did you receive information about support for feeling depressed or suicidal on your day of arrival?	20	27
21d	Did you have the opportunity to have a shower on your day of arrival?	40	27
21e	Did you get the opportunity to have a free telephone call on your day of arrival?	19	25
21f	Did you get information about routine requests on your day of arrival?	50	29
21g	Did you get something to eat on your day of arrival?	90	93
21h	Did you get information about visits on your day of arrival?	53	34
22a	Did you have access to the chaplain/priest within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	19	15
22b	Did you have access to someone from healthcare within the first 24 hours?	58	63
22c	Did you have access to a Listener/Samaritans within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	17	2
22d	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	46	34
23	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	77	50
24	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	87	85
25	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	67	80
<b>SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody</b>			
27a	Can you get access to legal reference books?	21	20
27b	Can you get access to communication with your solicitor or legal representative?	70	73
27c	Can you get access to information about leave to appeal?	32	30
27d	Can you get access to legal visits?	70	62
27e	Can you get access to help with legal costs?	41	37
27f	Can you get access to bail information?	24	26
28a	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week	82	75
28b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day'	98	93

## Key to tables

		White Irish	White British
	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the White British comparator		
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the white British comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the White Irish and White British comparator		
<b>28c</b>	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally receive clean sheets every week'	95	91
<b>SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody (continued)</b>			
<b>28d</b>	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week	68	88
<b>28e</b>	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes'	63	47
<b>28f</b>	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	81	68
<b>28g</b>	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: can you normally get your stored property, if you need to	73	63
<b>29</b>	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	46	44
<b>30</b>	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	46	55
<b>31</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	41	35
<b>32a</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	80	84
<b>32b</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	73	73
<b>33a</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	27	26
<b>33b</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	15	12
<b>33c</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly?	22	20
<b>33d</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly?	20	14
<b>33e</b>	Are you given information about how to make an appeal?	32	22
<b>34</b>	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	29	16
<b>35</b>	Do you know how to apply to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman?	63	72
<b>36</b>	Is it easy/very easy to contact the Independent Monitoring Board (BOV)?	27	16
<b>37</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	46	58
<b>38</b>	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	49	51
<b>39a</b>	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C & R)?	7	5
<b>39b</b>	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	28	19
<b>40a</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	57	64
<b>40b</b>	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	63	56
<b>41</b>	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	66	70
<b>42a</b>	Do you have a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	56	64
<b>42b</b>	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	72	79
<b>SECTION 5: Safety</b>			
<b>44</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	48	59
<b>46</b>	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	17	43
<b>47a</b>	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By prisoners)	12	29

## Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the White British comparator	White Irish	White British
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the white British comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the White Irish and White British comparator		
<b>47b</b>	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5	5
<b>SECTION 5: Safety (continued)</b>			
<b>47c</b>	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	5
<b>47d</b>	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5	2
<b>47e</b>	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By prisoners)	2	0
<b>47f</b>	Have you ever had your canteen/property taken since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	7
<b>47g</b>	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By prisoners)	5	10
<b>47h</b>	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (by prisoners)	5	2
<b>48</b>	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	43	19
<b>49a</b>	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By staff)	33	19
<b>49b</b>	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By staff)	7	5
<b>49c</b>	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By staff)	0	0
<b>49d</b>	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	10	0
<b>49e</b>	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By staff)	2	0
<b>49f</b>	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By staff)	10	5
<b>49g</b>	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (By staff)	10	0
<b>50</b>	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	15	10
<b>SECTION 6: Healthcare</b>			
<b>52</b>	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	45	53
<b>53a</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the doctor is good/very good?	18	30
<b>53b</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the nurse is good/very good?	61	77
<b>53c</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dentist is good/very good?	59	64
<b>53d</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the optician is good/very good?	38	45
<b>53e</b>	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dispensing staff/pharmacist is good/very good?	48	55
<b>54</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	34	39
<b>55a</b>	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison?	3	0
<b>55b</b>	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison?	8	5
<b>SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity</b>			
<b>57a</b>	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	41	58
<b>57b</b>	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	31	50
<b>57c</b>	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	57	47

## Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the White British comparator	White Irish	White British
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the white British comparator		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the White Irish and White British comparator		
<b>57d</b>	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	31	45
<b>57e</b>	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	41	52
<b>SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity (continued)</b>			
<b>58</b>	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	17	26
<b>59</b>	Can you get access to a newspaper every day?	85	83
<b>60</b>	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	54	50
<b>61</b>	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	61	49
<b>62</b>	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	19	16
<b>63</b>	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekend day?(This includes hours at education, at work etc)	12	12
<b>64</b>	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	85	60
<b>65</b>	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	21	25
<b>SECTION 8: Resettlement</b>			
<b>67</b>	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	19	34
<b>68</b>	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	33	55
<b>69</b>	Do you have a custody/sentence plan?	61	37
<b>70</b>	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your sentence plan?	50	30
<b>71</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	36	30
<b>72</b>	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	22	29
<b>73</b>	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	62	53
<b>74</b>	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	72	80
<b>75a</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding a job on release?	40	54
<b>75b</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding accommodation on release?	46	61
<b>75c</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with your finances in preparation for release?	36	34
<b>75d</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with claiming benefits on release?	44	40
<b>75e</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	29	32
<b>75f</b>	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with external drugs courses etc	54	41
<b>75g</b>	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with continuity of healthcare on release?	43	38
<b>76</b>	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	61	51