

Report on an announced inspection of
Maghaberry Prison
19 - 23 March 2012

December 2012



The Regulation and
Quality Improvement
Authority

eti

Criminal Justice Inspection
Northern Ireland
a better justice system for all





Report on an announced inspection of **Maghaberry Prison**

19 - 23 March 2012

**by the Chief Inspector of Criminal Justice in Northern
Ireland, Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons, the
Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority and
Education and Training Inspectorate**

Laid before the Northern Ireland Assembly under Section 49(2) of the
Justice (Northern Ireland) Act 2002 (as amended by paragraph 7(2) of
Schedule 13 to The Northern Ireland Act 1998 (Devolution of Policing
and Justice Functions) Order 2010) by the Department of Justice.

December 2012





Contents

List of abbreviations	iv
Chief Inspectors' Foreword	v
Fact page	vii
Healthy prison summary	ix

Section 1: Inspection Report

Chapter 1: Safety	3
Chapter 2: Respect	19
Chapter 3: Purposeful activity	35
Chapter 4: Resettlement	41
Chapter 5: Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice	51

Section 2: Appendices

Appendix 1: Inspection Team - March 2012	60
Appendix 2: Prison population profile	61
Appendix 3: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	66



List of abbreviations

BME	Black and Minority Ethnic
CJI	Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland
CNA	Certified Normal Accommodation
C&R	Control and Restraint
CSRAs	Cell Sharing Risk Assessments
CSU	Care and Separation Unit
DCS	Determinate Custodial Sentence
DoJ	Department of Justice
DST	Dedicated Search Team
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
ETI	Education and Training Inspectorate
FSO	Family Support Officer
HMIP	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
IP	In-possession (medication)
MDT	Mandatory Drug Testing
NIPS	Northern Ireland Prison Service
OMU	Offender Management Unit
PBNI	Probation Board for Northern Ireland
PEEPS	Personal Emergency Evacuation Plans
PREPS	Progressive Regime and Earned Privileges Scheme
PSST	Prisoner Safety and Support Team
RQIA	Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority
SEHSCT	South Eastern Health and Social Care Trust
SIR	Security Information Report
SPAR	Supporting Prisoners at Risk



Chief Inspectors' Foreword

Maghaberry Prison is a complex and challenging establishment. It holds 1,000 men including remand prisoners, fine defaulters, lifers and a small number of separated paramilitary prisoners. A significant number have mental health problems and learning difficulties, while others are vulnerable because of their offences or disputes with other prisoners.

Previous inspections have been very critical of the way Maghaberry responded to these challenges. On this occasion significant weaknesses remain, but we found areas of improvement and assess the prison as having progressed by one level in three out of the four healthy prison tests, while respect remained the same. Despite these improvements the prison still has a long way to go.

The number of self-harm incidents was not high and arrangements for the support of those at risk of suicide or self-harm had improved, though were inconsistently applied. The Donard Day Centre opened in 2011, and its multi-disciplinary team provided excellent care for some very vulnerable prisoners, and in many ways it was the jewel in Maghaberry's crown.

Record-keeping by staff was poor but professional relationships between staff and prisoners were better and delivered more dynamic security intelligence. While the Care and Support (Segregation) unit regime was reasonable for those who were there for short periods, it was completely inadequate for prisoners who stayed for longer periods. There was a good induction programme for new arrivals, but some were missed.

Some important features of prison life, such as the Progressive Regime and Earned Privileges scheme, were overly-punitive. Security could be overbearing and did not sufficiently relate to individual risk assessments. Nevertheless the introduction of 'free flow', which enabled most prisoners to move freely within the prison during the core day, was a major improvement and helped to normalise the atmosphere. The Dedicated Search Team, which we had grave concerns about during the last inspection, was no longer the pernicious influence it had once been.

Many prisoners told us they had felt unsafe in the prison at some time. There was no effective monitoring of violent incidents to identify when and where they were likely to occur or how they could be prevented. Despite high staffing levels, association and exercise areas were not adequately supervised. We remain concerned that the prison does not provide a sufficiently safe environment for those held there.

The introduction of mandatory drug testing was a good initiative and the structural arrangements for delivery of health services had improved. Unfortunately Maghaberry's health care department was disorganised and beset by staff shortages when we inspected, and this was having an adverse impact on clinical outcomes. We were concerned about the lax management of divertible medication and managers told us this was a significant cause of bullying in the prison. Very poor drug treatment processes were dangerous for prisoners.

At the time of the inspection, some separated Republican prisoners in Roe House were engaged in a dirty protest. The resulting conditions posed a threat to the health of prisoners and staff, but hygiene arrangements were being carefully managed and nobody had suffered any ill effects at the time of writing. The rest of Maghaberry was clean but suffered from considerable overcrowding. At the time of the inspection, 538 prisoners (more than half of the population) were sharing small, cramped cells that were designed for only one person.



Maghaberry's own statistics confirmed there were unequal outcomes for Roman Catholic prisoners in several important respects, yet this sensitive issue was not being effectively addressed. There were insufficient activity places available and prisoners spent too long locked in cells. A fully-employed prisoner could spend about nine hours a day out of cell on weekdays, but too many of those working were employed in unchallenging orderly roles, which offered nothing like a normal work environment. It was unsatisfactory that the 50% of prisoners who were unemployed spent up to 20 hours a day in their cells.

The new Learning and Skills Centre is an excellent resource so it was frustrating that staffing shortages meant it was considerably under-used. The learning and skills curriculum was too narrow and was not aligned to local labour market needs. Otherwise, there were more hopeful signs – the quality of teaching, training and learning was generally good, as was the provision of basic literacy and numeracy and English for Speakers of Other Languages; there was some innovative use of mentors in education; the library was a good resource and physical education was very good.

Resettlement was the most positive aspect of Maghaberry Prison. Despite the range of prisoners held, there were good attempts to address the behaviour of both short and long-term prisoners including some prisoners on remand, and to meet the basic practical needs of those who were about to be released. Public protection arrangements were functioning better than when we last inspected. Some aspects of provision for lifers had improved, although the closure of the Belfast 'step down' facility for testing long-term prisoners in a less secure environment was a big loss and should be urgently redressed. Provision of offending behaviour programmes had improved since the new Offender Management Unit took over co-ordination, but not all needs were met. The visitors halls were cramped and noisy and visits did not start on time, although other support for prisoners' families such as the Quakers Visitor Centre, was very positive.

Maghaberry remains a prison which does not yet provide a sufficient level of safety and respectful treatment, with too many prisoners having little purposeful activity to do. Nevertheless, this inspection found signs of real improvement. Some excellent work was being done by individual staff in a context where professional relationships overall were improving, and investment in new facilities had created opportunities for further improvement. At a time of major reform throughout the Northern Ireland Prison Service, these improvements now need to be embedded in the culture and processes at Maghaberry so that the progress that has been made is built on further.

Brendan McGuigan
Chief Inspector of Criminal Justice in
Northern Ireland
November 2012

Nick Hardwick
Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons
July 2012



Fact page

Task of the establishment

Maghaberry Prison is the largest and most complex of the three prisons that make up the Northern Ireland Prison Service (NIPS). It is a category A prison and operates both as a committal prison for prisoners on determinate sentences, as well as a dispersal prison for prisoners allocated to Magilligan Prison. It is a remand prison for all adult male prisoners in Northern Ireland and accommodates a range of sentenced prisoners, including life-sentenced, indeterminate and extended custody and separated prisoners, as well as fine defaulters and civil prisoners.

Prison status

Public sector – NIPS.

Region/Department

Northern Ireland.

Number held

994 (19 March 2012).

Certified normal accommodation

860.

Operational capacity

1,230.

Date of last full inspection

19-23 January 2009.

Brief history

The Maghaberry site originally included two prisons. The women's prison, Mourne House, was adjacent to the main male prison. In 2004, women were transferred to Ash House at Hydebank Wood Young Offenders Centre. Since then the Mourne House complex has been developed primarily into a life sentence prisoner centre for those moving into pre-tariff range. Braid House is now open within the complex providing an additional cell capacity of 130.

The male prison was opened in 1987 and, until 1996, had a relatively static long-term and life-sentenced population. Following the closure of the Crumlin Road Prison that year, non-paramilitary remand prisoners and short-term sentenced prisoners began to be held at Maghaberry. Since 2003, it has held separated paramilitary prisoners from Loyalist and Republican backgrounds.

A new house block is being constructed, which will provide an additional 120 cells. When opened in mid-2012, this will help ease the current accommodation pressure and allow capacity for the refurbishment of older accommodation.



Short description of residential units

Bann House – used for committal, induction and key workers. Key workers are designated as drugs-free prisoners who are regularly tested. The total Certified Normal Accommodation (CNA) was 108, with a maximum capacity of 180 prisoners.

Lagan House – mostly remand prisoners with a total CNA of 109 and a maximum occupancy of 190.

Erne House – used mostly for determinate-sentenced and life-sentenced prisoners (with a small number of prisoners on remand). The total CNA was 106 with a maximum capacity of 137 prisoners.

Foyle House – used mainly for remand prisoners with one special criteria wing, the Donard Landing, which accommodated vulnerable prisoners and those with challenging behaviours. The total CNA was 108.

Glen House – used as a vulnerable prisoner unit. The total CNA was 15 with a maximum capacity of 30 prisoners.

Bush House – used mostly for remand prisoners and Loyalist separated prisoners. The total CNA was 95 with a maximum capacity of 144 prisoners.

Roe House – used mostly for remand and Republican separated prisoners. The total CNA was 90 with a maximum capacity of 138 prisoners.

Braid House – located in the Mourne House complex it held mostly life-sentenced prisoners and a small number of prisoners serving extended custody sentences. The total CNA was 128 with a maximum capacity of 128 prisoners.

Wilson House – located in the Mourne House complex it held life-sentenced prisoners. The total CNA was 39 with a maximum capacity of 39 prisoners.

Martin House – located in the Mourne House complex it held prisoners under protection. The total CNA was 15 with a maximum capacity of 18 prisoners.

Health care – used for prisoners with primary care health issues and those who require mental health assessment.

Name of Governor/Director

Pat Maguire.

Escort contractor

Prisoner Escorting and Court Custody Services.

Health service commissioner and providers

South Eastern Health and Social Care Trust.

Learning and skills providers

NIPS.

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Dennis Constable.



Healthy prison summary

Introduction

- HP1 This inspection was led by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) at the invitation of the Chief Inspector of Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland (CJI). The inspection was conducted jointly with CJI, the Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority (RQIA) and the Education and Training Inspectorate (ETI).
- HP2 HMIP is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, immigration detention facilities and police custody.
- HP3 This inspection was carried out in accordance with the United Kingdom's international obligations arising from its status as a signatory to the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention Against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of, and conditions for, detainees.
- HP4 The report contains a summary of the conditions and treatment of prisoners, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first used by HMIP in their thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. The criteria are:

Safety - prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely;

Respect - prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity;

Purposeful activity - prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them; and

Resettlement - prisoners are prepared for their release into the community and effectively helped to reduce the likelihood of re-offending.

- HP5 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the Northern Ireland Prison Service headquarters and/or the Department of Justice (DoJ).

• **outcomes for prisoners are good against this healthy prison test**

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

• **outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good 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. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.

• **outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test**

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



- **outcomes for prisoners are poor 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.

Safety

- HP6 Reception was well run, but there were delays. First night arrangements were reasonable. Induction had been revamped and was good, but the tracking system to ensure prisoners attended induction sessions was not working. Violence reduction arrangements were very new, and many prisoners in our survey felt unsafe. Supervision of some prisoner areas was poor and more needed to be done to monitor trends in incidents. Arrangements to support vulnerable prisoners, were improving but there were still gaps. Some elements of physical security were overbearing but the free flow movement of prisoners was a major improvement. The introduction of mandatory drug testing (MDT) was a good initiative with room for further improvement. The use of the Dedicated Search Team (DST) had improved. The application of the progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme (PREPS) was predominantly punishment orientated. The population in the Care and Separation Unit (CSU) was complex and some prisoners stayed there too long, but staff-prisoner relationships were good. There needed to be better management of use of force and special accommodation. Substance use services and inappropriate management of in-possession medication were major concerns. On the basis of this full inspection, we considered that outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.
- HP7 Prisoners complained that they felt unsafe in cellular vans, and the practice of handcuffing them while in transit often appeared disproportionate. Video links were used extensively to reduce the number of prisoners that needed to leave the prison for court.
- HP8 Reception was generally clean, holding rooms were adequate and supervision was very good. Delays were caused by groups of prisoners arriving at the prison in the late afternoon or evening.
- HP9 Health care interviews took too long to complete and had a negative impact on the amount of time prisoners spent in reception.
- HP10 Prisoners' immediate needs were identified during a private interview, and there was evidence that emerging issues were dealt with quickly and with sensitivity. Officers were welcoming, respectful and clearly focused on prisoner safety.
- HP11 All new prisoners were admitted to Bann House. Living conditions were reasonable, communal areas were clean and cells were well prepared. Handover procedures for night staff were good.
- HP12 Changes to the induction programme were positive. The rolling programme delivered by a multi-disciplinary team was comprehensive. Sessions were sometimes delayed or cancelled and tracking systems to ensure that prisoners attended sessions had not been fully developed.
- HP13 In our survey, prisoners' perceptions about their experiences during their early days were poor, and many felt unsafe on their first night.

- 
- HP14 The development of the Prisoner Safety and Support Team (PSST) had brought an improved focus to safer custody, but much work to develop an effective response to bullying and violence was needed. Many prisoners, particularly in the main prison felt less safe than in comparator prisons, and this was particularly the case in communal and association areas and during movement around the prison. There was a need for better staff supervision in these areas.
- HP15 There had been no effective strategy to address bullying over recent years. The existing strategy had been relaunched and very few prisoners had been managed under the strategy. There was very limited collection or analysis of data on violence. Managers believed most incidents of bullying were related to the acquisition of prescribed medicines.
- HP16 Prisoners who were vulnerable for a range of reasons were identified and supported through good individual support plans, and a multi-disciplinary group attended case reviews.
- HP17 There was a reasonable focus on learning from deaths following high profile and critical reports but more robust audits were needed. Death in custody action plans were completed, acted on and updated, although some recommendations were still outstanding.
- HP18 There were an average of 21 incidents of self-harm per month. Given the population, this did not appear excessive. Limited routine investigations of serious self-harm incidents were carried out.
- HP19 An average of 46 supporting prisoners at risk (SPAR) documents were opened each month. The quality was mixed. There was no consistent case manager, but some entries and reviews demonstrated good levels of care. Few reviews were multi-disciplinary.
- HP20 Observation cells and strip clothing were used too frequently. Most though were only used for short periods. Only about two thirds of staff had relevant training.
- HP21 There were difficulties in retaining Listeners, but they were well supported by staff and the Samaritans. There was no Listener Scheme at the Mourne House complex.
- HP22 The Donard Landing in Foyle House and the Donard Day Centre were good resources providing vulnerable prisoners with support and purposeful activity, and interactions with staff were good. Broader arrangements for safeguarding vulnerable adults needed improvement, as did liaison with relevant external support organisations.
- HP23 Reasonable progress had been made in implementing more proportionate security arrangements, particularly in relation to the free flow movement of prisoners. More work was required to reduce other aspects of unnecessary physical security.
- HP24 The management of separated prisoners remained overly restrictive; for example, restricted unlock arrangements were not based on an individual risk assessment.
- HP25 At previous inspections we described the Dedicated Search Team (DST) as having a disproportionate influence in many aspects of the prison. This included being implicated in the large number of alleged assaults. This negative impact had reduced considerably, but did need ongoing monitoring.



- HP26 Dynamic security was improving in line with staff-prisoner relationships. While still not at an adequate level, monthly Security Information Report (SIR) submissions had doubled since the previous inspection. The management and analysis of security intelligence was limited.
- HP27 It was positive that all those testing positive under MDT arrangements were referred to *Ad:ept* and/or the clinical team. The average positive random rate across the six months to February 2012 was 11.3%. During the same period, 92 suspicion tests had been conducted with a positive rate of 36.9%.¹ The testing environment was poor.
- HP28 More prisoners were on the PREPS basic regime than we normally see. Demotion to the basic level was too often for minor infringements rather than as a result of a pattern of poor behaviour, and it was inappropriate that PREPS was linked to drug testing. Many prisoners remained on the basic level even if their behaviour improved.
- HP29 The level of adjudications had risen since the previous inspection, although the figure was inflated owing to the ongoing actions of some separated prisoners. The data analysis of trends needed improvement.
- HP30 Use of force had decreased slightly since the previous inspection. There was a lack of governance, quality assurance and scrutiny. There was also limited governance of the use of special accommodation. The duration of stay in these cells had sometimes been considerable (up to one week).
- HP31 The cleanliness of the general environment of the CSU was adequate, and relationships between staff and prisoners were good. The regime for prisoners serving punishment had improved to an appropriate level.
- HP32 The CSU regime was a poor environment for prisoners remaining segregated for long periods, and concerns relating to the psychological deterioration of these men were exacerbated by the absence of a formal multi-disciplinary care plan process (reintegration planning). We were also concerned by the absence of a formal initial safety screen once they were relocated to the unit, particularly given the number of prisoners subject to SPAR arrangements.
- HP33 The management of prisoners with drug and alcohol problems was poor. Waiting times to be assessed for treatment were so long that many were effectively detoxified before treatment had started. This meant that the treatment effectively amounted to a re-toxification process. The high use of in-possession (IP) medication was a source of major concern and contributed to safety issues.
- HP34 Alcohol detoxification patients were frequently given IP medication and were therefore not seen by health care staff on a daily basis, which was potentially unsafe.

¹ Inspection methodology: There are five key sources of evidence for inspection: observation; prisoner surveys; discussions with prisoners; discussions with staff and relevant third parties; and documentation. During inspections, we use a mixed-method approach to data gathering, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. All findings and judgements are triangulated, which increases the validity of the data gathered. Survey results show the collective response (in percentages) from prisoners in the establishment being inspected compared with the collective response (in percentages) from respondents in all establishments of that type (the comparator figure). Where references to comparisons between these two sets of figures are made in the report, these relate to statistically significant differences only. Statistical significance is a way of estimating the likelihood that a difference between two samples indicates a real difference between the populations from which the samples are taken, rather than being due to chance. If a result is very unlikely to have arisen by chance, we say it is 'statistically significant'. The significance level is set at 0.05, which means that there is only a 5% chance that the difference in results is due to chance. (Adapted from Towel et al (eds), *Dictionary of Forensic Psychology*).



Respect

- HP35 Residential units were clean and in a good state of repair, but many cells were over crowded. Staff-prisoner relationships had improved, although there was little interaction during association. There was no personal officer scheme. There was a focus on issues of equality between Roman Catholic and Protestant prisoners, but continuing unequal outcomes had not been addressed. Work with disabled, older foreign national and gay prisoners needed more attention. Faith provision was well developed. The management of complaints was reasonable but some made about staff needed better and more appropriate investigation. The structure of health services had improved, but organisational and staffing problems were having an adverse impact on clinical outcomes. Food was adequate, but not popular with many prisoners. The shop offered an appropriate range of goods. On the basis of this inspection, we considered that outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.
- HP36 Residential units were clean and in a good state of repair, but exercise areas were mostly small and austere. Just over half of prisoners were in double cells designed for one. Prisoners knew how to submit a request, but some responses took too long.
- HP37 We observed mainly positive staff interactions with prisoners, and the use of first names was routine. This was not reflected in wing file notes, which were mostly about behaviour and geared towards PREPS assessments. There were still some staff whose behaviour towards prisoners was more distant, and there was little interaction during association periods. Most prisoners in our survey said that staff treated them with respect and that they had someone to approach if they had a problem. There was no personal officer scheme in place.
- HP38 There were monthly prisoner forums, but minutes were not on display in residential units.
- HP39 Leadership around diversity was good, but not underpinned by a clear strategic approach. A large amount of data on inequality had been collected. This repeatedly identified Roman Catholic prisoners as receiving unequal treatment, but there was insufficient action to address this, particularly in areas where officers had discretion.
- HP40 The monthly equality meeting was well attended and included prisoner equality representatives. However, the representatives were not permitted to stay for the whole meeting.
- HP41 Older and disabled prisoners were not always identified early on following reception and their individual needs were not properly assessed and addressed. Black and minority ethnic prisoners including Travellers felt reasonably positive about the way they were being treated.
- HP42 In our survey, foreign national prisoners responded more negatively across a range of indicators. They were identified on reception, at which stage some needs were acted on, but this was inconsistent. The level of the UK Border Agency's engagement with these prisoners did not meet their needs.
- HP43 There was evidence that interpretation services were being used appropriately, but some staff preferred to rely on other prisoners for matters that required confidentiality.
- HP44 The chaplaincy team was well integrated across the prison. The chapel and multi-faith areas were welcoming and well used for a wide range of faith services and other activities.



- HP45 Our survey results concerning the fairness of responses to complaints were positive, but Roman Catholic prisoners were less positive than Protestant prisoners. The survey also indicated that some prisoners felt they had been prevented from making a complaint. Not all complaints about staff or the search team had been dealt with by someone of sufficient authority. Complaints were answered on time, and the quality of responses was generally good. Quality assurance was limited.
- HP46 Only limited information was available about legal rights and the provision of bail information was inconsistent.
- HP47 Health care partnership arrangements were not working effectively. A health needs analysis was being undertaken, but had not yet had an influence on services. While the Senior Management Team was almost in place to assist in driving improvements forward, there were ongoing significant staffing shortfalls.
- HP48 Some health care rooms had poor infection control measures in place. Resuscitation equipment was not always immediately available to all staff out-of-hours.
- HP49 There was no monitoring of equity of access to services. Waits for GP clinics in the majority of units were not excessive. There was little monitoring of lifelong conditions, nurse-led clinics rarely took place and health promotion was limited.
- HP50 The reception health screening tool needed revision.
- HP51 Referral to secondary care services was problematic and was not robustly managed. As a result prisoners experienced long waits. The number of escorts available for outside hospital appointments was not sufficient for the size of the population.
- HP52 The in-patient unit admission criteria were not clear. There was some evidence of a therapeutic regime, but it seemed more like an 'enhanced landing' rather than a hospital. The physical environment had improved.
- HP53 In our survey, 67% stated that they were on medication; of those 91% stated that they had the medication IP. This included prisoners with medication that was known to be divertible. Staff were not carrying out regular checks on prisoners who had IP medication.
- HP54 Dentist waiting lists were extensive, but urgent cases could be seen the next day.
- HP55 The structure of mental health services had improved since the last inspection. There was usually a three-week wait for an assessment. The Mental Health Team had increased and included a range of health professionals, such as a full-time consultant and an occupational therapist, but the majority of nurses were bank or agency staff. Prisoners were not sufficiently involved.
- HP56 Transfers to NHS secure beds took too long, particularly for prisoners with very acute problems.
- HP57 We found the range and standard of food to be reasonable but unpopular with many prisoners. Meal times were reasonably spaced, but were served too early in some houses. There was no provision of halal prepared food.
- HP58 The prisoner shop offered an appropriate range of goods.



Purposeful activity

- HP59 Time out of cell was reasonable, but there were still too many prisoners locked behind their doors during the core hours of the day. There were insufficient activities to occupy the population and around a half were unemployed. There was a need for a more strategic approach to learning and skills. Much of the work available was of low quality. Learning and skills provision was inadequate and failed to meet the needs of the population, although it had improved and there had been a positive investment in the Learning and Skills Centre. Life-sentenced prisoners had only a limited number of opportunities. Education was generally good but some elements of provision were not fully utilised. Provision for speakers of other languages (ESOL) and basic skills provision were well developed. The library was good, and PE very good. On the basis of this inspection, we considered that outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.
- HP60 Time out of cell for most prisoners in the Mourne House complex was good at about eight hours per day for nearly all prisoners.
- HP61 In theory, it was similar on the main site. However, for a significant number of prisoners who did not work or attend activities, time out of cell was more limited. Unemployed prisoners, for example, could access nearer to three or four hours per day through exercise and daily association.
- HP62 At a roll check in the morning during the core hours of the day, about 30% of the population were locked in their cells on the main site, which was better than at the last inspection.
- HP63 Overall learning and skills provision had improved but much work was still needed. An excellent new Learning and Skills Centre has been established, but ongoing staffing issues, which had remained unresolved for too long, meant that capacity was under-utilised and some of the provision lacked coherence. Only a narrow range of appropriate programmes were on offer on a consistent basis. There was a significant lack of strategic support for learning and skills from the NIPS headquarters.
- HP64 There were approximately 146 places for education, but the capacity was under-utilised; attendance varied. The quality of most of the teaching, training and learning was good, as was ESOL provision. However, provision was constrained by the lack of adequate staffing.
- HP65 The curriculum provision to develop the prisoners' literacy and numeracy skills was good and was underpinned by effective learning plans. Provision for remand prisoners had improved significantly since the last inspection. There was a need for more proactive support for prisoners undertaking Open University courses.
- HP66 The range of education and skills provision for those prisoners who could not access the Learning and Skills Centre was inadequate. These included those at the Mourne House complex and in the CSU.
- HP67 The lack of information and communications technology (ICT) provision was unsatisfactory and a source of considerable frustration for many prisoners.
- HP68 Too few prisoners were employed in appropriately challenging and realistic work activities. Most were employed in a range of orderly job roles. Approximately half of the prisoners were not engaged in regular activities or work during the inspection. The work allocation process included the main areas and departments of the prison and was prisoner-centred.



- HP69 The quality of training and learning in the workshops was good. Good or very good standards of work were evident across most of the vocational training programmes.
- HP70 Although a good range of vocational skills was provided in the general craft areas, more needed to be done to re-balance the curriculum to better match labour market trends and available employment opportunities.
- HP71 The library provision and access was good; it was well maintained and offered a good range of contemporary and recreational reading stock.
- HP72 There were good, equitable access arrangements to the gym. The programmes and courses delivered were appropriate to meet the needs of the prison population, although an increase in numbers was placing a strain on resources. There was a flexible programme of activities, which could be adapted to meet the needs of particular groups of prisoners.
- HP73 There needed to be better links between PE, health care and education to encourage inactive prisoners to engage in more activities.

Resettlement

HP74 The resettlement strategy was sensible and in part based on a needs analysis. Sentence planning arrangements were good, but there was no custody planning for remand prisoners. Resettlement interventions were available for those serving shorter sentences and for remand prisoners. Public protection arrangements were well developed. Work with lifers had improved since the last inspection, but still needed attention. The lack of a 'step down' facility for lifers was a major omission. There were reasonable reintegration services in most areas, but the focus on drug and alcohol issues on release was poor, although some positive interventions were offered. Family support work was good, although visits needed attention. The provision and availability of offending behaviour programmes met most, but not all needs. However, good non-accredited interventions were offered. On the basis of this inspection, we considered that outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

- HP75 The resettlement strategy was comprehensive and partly needs-based.
- HP76 The Offender Management Unit (OMU) worked very well and the integrated staff group provided prisoners with a comprehensive service. A three-tiered approach that reflected risks, as well as the needs of prisoners, was adopted. This ranged from intensive engagement for those serving longer sentences, to throughcare work with short-term prisoners. There was no custody planning for remand prisoners.
- HP77 Most eligible prisoners had a sentence plan. Prisoners who were motivated to progress could achieve a lot, but more needed to be done with those who were less motivated.
- HP78 Managerial oversight had improved, including in areas such as cross-departmental work, dip sampling of files, feedback to staff and relevant staff training. Collaboration between offender management and residential staff to address resettlement issues had improved but was still not sufficient. A 'personal officer' could have played a part in this process, but this role had not been fulfilled.
- HP79 Applications for home leave had doubled since our last inspection.
- HP80 Public protection arrangements had improved and were strong.

- 
- HP81 Categorisation decisions were well managed.
- HP82 Sentence planning and file recording for lifers needed further development, but progression and regression arrangements had improved. The suspension of the Prisoner Assessment Unit (PAU) or 'step down' facility was a major loss requiring urgent remedy. The lifers' regime was too limited with insufficient purposeful activity opportunities. Joint working with the OMU to manage them was a positive step.
- HP83 All prisoners' initial resettlement needs were assessed at induction, and referrals were made when needed. Sentenced prisoners attended a pre-release interview.
- HP84 Experienced housing advice workers provided advocacy and support to prisoners with backing from peer workers.
- HP85 The links between Learning and Skills Unit and the OMU were effective. The Northern Ireland Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NIACRO) delivered an appropriate accredited course to provide all prisoners, including those on remand, with a good opportunity to develop a range of job search and employability skills. There was inadequate access to ICT facilities, particularly the internet, to complement and improve this provision.
- HP86 Connections with employers, designed to prepare a small number of prisoners for progression into appropriate employment, were improving through a pilot programme linking up with an external stakeholder.
- HP87 Systems were in place to ensure that all prisoners who needed to see a nurse on release did so.
- HP88 A draft drug and alcohol strategy was in place but was not based on a substance misuse needs analyses. The drug strategy was not adequately resourced or supported by key stakeholders. The monthly drug strategy committee meeting was very poorly attended.
- HP89 Psychosocial services were provided by *Ad:ept*, including one-to-one work, the delivery of the prisoners addressing substance related offending (*P-ASRO*) programme and work with prisoners with alcohol problems. Waiting lists for psychosocial treatment were very long. Links with community agencies were reasonably good although waiting lists could be up to six months, making effective resettlement and through-care extremely difficult.
- HP90 A trained in-house worker from the NIACRO provided finance, benefit and debt support, although they did not entirely meet the demand for the service.
- HP91 Our survey was more positive than the comparator about support to maintain relationships with family and friends. Two family support workers continued to help prisoners and families to maintain relationships.
- HP92 Changes to the booking line had made booking visits easier. There was a well managed, supportive Visitors' Centre.
- HP93 Some prisoners and visitors continued to complain that they did not receive or make full length visits and one visits room was cramped and noisy. Very good child-centred visits were sometimes cancelled. Barnados continued to provide parenting programmes and the *Storybook Dads* scheme.
- HP94 The accredited offending behaviour programmes offered met most but not all of the general needs of the prisoner population, and waiting lists for these were not excessive. The need for a domestic violence intervention had been recognised and was planned, and there was also a need for the core sex offender



treatment programme to be delivered. Management of programmes had improved and access was managed appropriately. There continued to be a good range of non-accredited courses.

Main concerns and recommendations

HP95 *Concern:* Prisoners in our survey were more likely to say that they felt unsafe than in comparator prisons and there had been a lack of an effective strategy for some time to address bullying. Data collection to inform the strategy and management of violence reduction was limited.

Recommendation: An effective strategy to reduce levels of violence and address bullying should be developed.

HP96 *Concern:* Use of in-possession medication was very high, including use of a range of divertible medications, and management checks were poor. This was implicated in concerns about bullying and safety.

Recommendation: Medication administration procedures should be changed to ensure the prevention of medication diversion. (See also section on the pharmacy.)

HP97 *Concern:* Management of prisoners with substance misuse issues was poor. Waiting times for treatment were too long, which meant that many prisoners were experiencing significant discomfort, and led to an unsafe detoxification/retoxication practice.

Recommendation: An adequately staffed and fully integrated multi-disciplinary Addictions Team should be established to deliver timely and effective clinical and psychosocial drug and alcohol services based on a full assessment of the population's needs and aspirations for recovery.

HP98 *Concern:* Too many prisoners were unemployed or in poor quality work. There were insufficient meaningful opportunities for prisoners to be purposefully occupied, experience 'real' work or achieve vocational qualifications.

Recommendation: A wider range and quantity of meaningful work opportunities should be developed and these should include accreditation and progression opportunities where possible.

HP99 *Concern:* Data had repeatedly indicated that Roman Catholic prisoners received unequal treatment in a range of areas, particularly those where staff had discretion, but these had not been adequately explored or dealt with. Outcomes were not good enough for older, disabled, or foreign national prisoners.

Recommendation: The prison should monitor all protected characteristics and understand and investigate all identified inequalities, particularly those relating to Roman Catholic prisoners and in areas where staff discretion can be applied. It should ensure that robust action is taken to address these in order to deliver equality of outcomes for all prisoners.

HP100 *Concern:* The Prisoner Assessment Unit (PAU) or 'step down' facility in Belfast had been closed leaving lifers with no opportunity to test themselves and demonstrate reductions in risk in a less secure environment – open rather than closed prison conditions.

Recommendation: The NIPS should develop a new pre-release scheme for lifers as a matter of urgency. The scheme should be based at a new 'step down' facility.

Section



Inspection Report

CHAPTER 1:

Safety



Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 There were reasonable relations between the prison and the escort provider. Escorting staff treated prisoners respectfully. All prisoners were handcuffed in secure prison vans while in transit, which was disproportionate to the risk they presented.
- 1.2 The escort provider for courts, transfers and nearly all other prisons was the NIPS Prisoner Escort Contract Service. Journey times were relatively short, usually under two hours. Prison vans we inspected were reasonably clean.
- 1.3 Escort staff were polite and respectful, prisoners' property was dealt with carefully, and those we spoke to were appropriately focused on prisoner safety.
- 1.4 Our observations showed that relationships between escort and reception staff were reasonably good. Information about prisoners was shared through conversation, but written escort records to help reception staff ensure the safety of prisoners were not in place.
- 1.5 Prisoners complained that they felt unsafe in cellular vans and the practice of handcuffing them while in transit appeared disproportionate in most cases.
- 1.6 There was extensive use of video link to reduce the number of prisoners that needed to leave the prison to attend court. During the inspection we saw that nearly 40 prisoners each day used the service.

Recommendations

- 1.7 **Written escort records of new prisoners should be put into place.**
- 1.8 **Prisoners should only be handcuffed in vehicles in exceptional circumstances to meet security concerns.**



Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are treated with respect and feel safe on their arrival into prison and for the first few days in custody. Prisoners' individual needs are identified and addressed, and they feel supported on their first night. During a prisoner's induction he/she is made aware of the prison routines, how to access available services and how to cope with imprisonment.

1.9 Reception was generally clean and well decorated and communal areas were welcoming. Holding rooms were adequately designed, very well equipped and levels of staff supervision were good. Staff were welcoming, respectful and clearly focused on prisoner safety, and facilities to interview prisoners in private had improved. There had also been improvements since the last inspection in first night and induction arrangements, but we were not assured that prisoners always received a full induction programme. Health care interviews took too long to complete and had a negative impact on the amount of time prisoners spent in holding rooms.

Reception

- 1.10 Reception was very busy with more than 100 prisoner movements daily, including an average of about 30 new arrivals.
- 1.11 Opening times appeared appropriate and were in keeping with timings of local courts. Staff remained on duty to deal with late arrivals, although these occasions were rare.
- 1.12 Communal areas were large, clean and well maintained. Holding rooms were bright and well decorated but up-to-date information had not been posted on notice boards. The supervision of prisoners was good.
- 1.13 On arrival, prisoners were met by a trained reception officer who carried out necessary checks. Prisoners were asked if they had understood what had happened to them before they had been transferred and if they had any immediate needs. All prisoners entering the prison were searched sensitively and in private. In contrast, prisoners leaving reception in the morning, usually for court, were often searched by the staff from the DST. Prisoners reported that these searches were not carried out respectfully, saying that officers were rude and abrupt. In our survey, 59% of respondents said that they had been searched respectfully which was significantly lower than the 74% in comparator prisons.
- 1.14 Problems had been caused by groups of prisoners arriving in large numbers in the late afternoon or evening. This resulted in excessively long stays in reception of up to three hours before being admitted into the first night centre in Bann House.
- 1.15 A first night and induction policy had been produced and we saw evidence that it was working effectively in reception, providing officers with direction regarding addressing prisoners' initial needs and safety.
- 1.16 Prisoners were interviewed by staff in private in a room away from the main holding rooms, where reasons for committal to custody were confirmed. Pro-formas were raised for reception, first night and induction, and cell sharing risk assessments were carried out.
- 1.17 All prisoners were asked about any special needs or problems they may have that required immediate help with.

- 
- 1.18 Most prisoners were seen in private by a nurse, but interviews took too long to complete and had a negative impact on the amount of time prisoners spent in holding rooms (see health care section).

First night

- 1.19 All new prisoners were admitted to Bann House. Living conditions were reasonable. Communal areas were clean and cells were well prepared.
- 1.20 Handover procedures for night staff were good. Our observations showed that staff were welcoming, respectful and clearly focused on prisoner safety. We saw that identified needs were being dealt with and that staff were particularly aware of the importance of dealing with any immediate risks.
- 1.21 In our survey of the main prison site however, 63% of respondents said that they felt safe on their first night which was significantly lower than the 72% in comparator prisons.

Induction

- 1.22 Officers based in Bann House usually saw all new prisoners individually during an interview on the day after their arrival. At the interview they explained the contents of the published induction pack, which covered relevant policies, procedures and rules. They were then assessed by probation staff and seen by a member of the chaplaincy team. The induction programme started the day after this.
- 1.23 A multi-disciplinary team delivered the induction programme in a well appointed area in the education department's Donard Unit (see also section on education and training). The published programme was comprehensive and well designed to meet the needs of newly arrived prisoners.
- 1.24 There was evidence, however, that not all prisoners received all elements of the induction. We observed that sessions were often late and sometimes cancelled, tracking systems to ensure that prisoners attended sessions had not been developed, and we met some prisoners who had not begun their induction until they had been at the prison for many days. Some prisoners said that they had not received any induction at all. In our survey, less than half of respondents said that induction covered everything they needed to know.

Recommendations

- 1.25 **The length of time prisoners spend in reception should be significantly reduced and initial health interviews shortened.**
- 1.26 **All searching of prisoners when entering or leaving the prison should be carried out sensitively and respectfully.**
- 1.27 **Tracking and other relevant processes should ensure all prisoners receive the information they need from a thorough induction programme.**

Housekeeping point

- 1.28 *Up-to-date information should be posted on notice boards in holding rooms.*



Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

Everyone feels safe from bullying and victimisation (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault). Prisoners at risk/subject to victimisation are protected through active and fair systems known to staff, prisoners and visitors, and which inform all aspects of the regime.

- 1.29 Prisoners in the main site still felt less safe than in comparator prisons. Indicators of violence were not routinely monitored or analysed to inform the violence reduction strategy. The formal procedures for addressing bullying had not been used effectively in recent years, and these had been re-launched. A Prisoner Safety and Support Team had been established and was providing a new focus on safer custody and providing good support to vulnerable prisoners. It was important that the caring ethos of the team was taken up by all residential officers.
- 1.30 A well resourced Prisoner Safety and Support Team (PSST) had been established for approximately six months. In addition to safer custody, the team was responsible for equality and diversity, foreign nationals and the Donard programme – a resource for vulnerable prisoners, which included staff from the South Eastern Health and Social Care Trust (SEHSCT) (see section on safeguarding). The new team had brought an improved focus to safer custody and this needed to become embedded with residential officers.
- 1.31 In addition to a quarterly service-wide safer custody forum, a strategic safer custody meeting had been introduced. Well attended weekly prisoner safety and support meetings considered vulnerable prisoners, many of whom had been subject to SPAR procedures. Individual support plans and serious cases reviews were good and focused on individual care. A member of the PSST contributed to the induction programme. The Donard programme had superseded the initiative for vulnerable prisoners known as REACH and now provided more effective support.
- 1.32 However, there was no effective prison-wide strategy to understand and respond to bullying and violence. Although a formal strategy had existed for investigating, monitoring and reviewing prisoners suspected of bullying, this had been used on only 15 occasions in the past two years.
- 1.33 The prison had anticipated the implementation of a service-wide challenging anti-social behaviour strategy, but this had been suspended as part of wider organisational changes. In response managers at Maghaberry had decided in February 2012 to re-launch the existing policy. Very few prisoners had been subject to this and it was too early to assess how effective this had been. A total of 126 staff had received training in the strategy.
- 1.34 It was difficult to assess with confidence the extent of violence in the prison. Data on violent incidents was largely held by the security department and not shared or used to inform a cohesive strategy. There was no routine monitoring and analysis of indicators of violence. Links between the security department and the strategic safer custody meeting team were weak.
- 1.35 Many responses to questions about safety in our survey indicated that prisoners in the main site still felt less safe than in comparator prisons. In our survey of the main site 23% compared with 14% in comparator prisons, said that they had been threatened or intimidated by other prisoners; 22% said that they felt unsafe at the time of the survey compared with 17% in comparator prisons. The prison had conducted its own survey in November 2011, the first for several years. This survey indicated similar concerns to our own. Both surveys indicated association, exercise and movements as the times during

- 
- which prisoners felt unsafe, which suggested the need for improved supervision. This was not the case in the Mourne House complex where far fewer prisoners reported feeling unsafe.
- 1.36 Despite security concerns for the large number of prisoners who had to be kept apart and prisoners' perceptions of safety in communal areas, there had been very few violent incidents following the introduction of free flow movement for the majority of prisoners.
- 1.37 Data on violent incidents could be provided when requested but there was a need for Managers to be assured of its accuracy (see paragraph 1.34). A monthly average of eight prisoner-on-prisoner assaults and three prisoner-on-staff assaults had been reported on the prisoner records information management (PRISM) database over the previous 11 months. Four serious assaults had been reported throughout the whole period.
- 1.38 A separate database recording prisoner accident investigation reports recorded details of injuries to prisoners. This indicated that there had been on average 17 injuries each month caused as a result of alleged assaults, assaults or fights (11 September 2011 to 12 February 2012). Some but not all investigations had been carried out to a reasonable standard, and cases had been referred to the police, where appropriate. In many of the cases the outcome of the investigation was not recorded on the database. Managers believed most incidents were related to bullying for prescribed medication (see section on the pharmacy).
- 1.39 None of the data provided caused us major concern when compared with comparator prisons but our lack of confidence in the robustness of data collection meant we were reluctant to draw firm conclusions.
- 1.40 Prisoners who needed protection from others were accommodated in a number of areas of the prison. Landings 3 and 4 in Bush House had evolved as areas in which to hold older prisoners and some who may have been targeted because of the nature of their offence. Forty-eight (63%) of the prisoners on these two landings had a conviction for a sexual offence. Other sex offenders were more widely integrated into the population. Improved monitoring would have helped identify if sex offenders were at an increased risk in the general population.
- 1.41 Glen House held nine prisoners who, mainly due to the nature of their cases, would have been at risk of being targeted by other prisoners. Assessments for Glen House were completed by the security department. The unit had a very limited regime, but prisoners said they felt safe.
- 1.42 An inspection of the treatment of vulnerable prisoners within the NIPS had been completed by CJI in 2009². A review by CJI and the RQIA of progress the prison had made was carried out in August 2011³. This acknowledged that there had been some improvements and that these were continuing.

Recommendations

- 1.43 **Visible staff supervision should be improved in association rooms and other areas where prisoners feel unsafe.**
- 1.44 **Accurate data on indicators of violence should be monitored and analysed routinely to inform the strategy.**

2 Vulnerable Prisoners - an inspection of the treatment of vulnerable prisoners by the Northern Ireland Prison Service, CJI, December 2009 - <http://www.cjini.org/CJNI/files/22/22219098-1d58-4924-887f-66f4f3db7e13.pdf>

3 The treatment of vulnerable prisoners by the Northern Ireland Prison Service - a follow-up review of inspection recommendations, CJI, January 2012 - <http://www.cjini.org/CJNI/files/73/73452cca-bbe1-493c-84ee-9cd16eb73d76.pdf>



Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

The prison provides a safe and secure environment which reduces the risk of self-harm and suicide. Prisoners are identified at an early stage and given the necessary support. All staff are aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, are appropriately trained and have access to proper equipment and support.

- 1.45 There was a reasonable focus on action planning following deaths, but this needed a more robust audit. Near fatal incidents were not adequately investigated or acted upon by the prison. There was a good knowledge concerning prisoners at risk of self-harm, but some improvements in SPAR procedures were needed, and observation cells were used too frequently. Listener numbers were low, but they felt well supported.
- 1.46 There had been three self-inflicted deaths in the prison since our last inspection. Two other deaths had occurred shortly after release. There was a good focus on learning from death investigations following several high profile and critical reports over recent years, including a review of vulnerable prisoners by CJI. Recommendations from investigations and inspections were included in a prison master action plan and reviewed every month by the Senior Management Team.
- 1.47 We were not convinced that Managers could be assured that all actions described as completed in action plans were actually in place. For example, some night managers were unaware that they could use an override key to gain access to units as outlined in the prison's action plan following a high profile death. Other measures such as access to ligature cutters and cell keys at night had improved.
- 1.48 Two investigations of serious near fatal incidents had been completed, including one which had occurred at court. The investigations, completed by headquarters staff, identified both good practice and recommendations for improvement. A further near fatal incident had been referred by the NIPS to the Prisoner Ombudsman for investigation and this was ongoing at the time of writing. Findings had not been translated into action plans within the prison. Local policy procedures required the Safer Custody Manager to investigate incidents of self-harm where appropriate, but the criteria for such investigations were not clear.
- 1.49 The prison and the SEHSCT held quarterly 'lessons learned' meetings to review adverse incidents and recommendations outlined in death investigation reports, but a review of death in custody reports indicated that not all recommendations had been achieved. Attendance by staff from the prison at recent meetings had been poor.
- 1.50 In contrast to data on violence, some good management information had been provided to the strategic safer custody meeting on SPAR procedures and incidents of self-harm. There were an average of 21 incidents of self-harm every month carried out by an average of 17 prisoners, which given the population did not appear to be excessive.
- 1.51 A risk register identified individuals who caused concern and they were discussed at the strategic safer custody meeting. Serious case reviews were convened for prisoners in crisis or where acute risks of further self-harm had been identified. Some prisoners on SPAR arrangements were the subject of parallel care planning processes through the Donard programme or received individual support plans managed by the PSST.

- 
- 1.52 An average of 46 SPAR cases were opened every month, involving an average of 42 prisoners – an increase on previous SPAR cases opened. A total of 25 SPAR documents were open on the first day of the inspection.
- 1.53 The quality of SPAR documents was mixed. There was no consistent case manager in most cases as senior officers were often deployed in different areas. Some entries in the daily records and a minority of reviews demonstrated good levels of care and engagement. We were pleased that no evidence was found, as we did at the last inspection, of prisoners on SPAR documents being routinely woken at night.
- 1.54 Few reviews were multi-disciplinary. These needed to be better organised with sufficient notice given to relevant departments. There was a range of potential resources to draw on to support prisoners, and the inclusion of other disciplines at reviews would have improved support plans. Bereavement counselling was available, as were a family support worker and volunteer visitors through the Quakers.
- 1.55 Deficiencies in SPAR procedures had been identified during investigations into deaths. Regular daily and monthly checks of the quality of SPARs were now completed by members of the PSST and shortcomings were fed back to wing managers.
- 1.56 Not all staff targeted for suicide prevention training had received it. Four hundred and twenty-three (51%) of staff had completed training in applied suicide intervention skills and 274 (33%) in SPAR.
- 1.57 There were 18 observation cells around the prison. They included sealed units with a camera, a television and a direct call facility to the Samaritans. Although the physical condition of these cells was monitored regularly, the length of time for which they were used, or the use of strip clothing was not. Data suggested that from September 2011 to February 2012 these cells had been used on 86 occasions and prisoners placed in strip clothing on 45 occasions. We were not assured that these measures were being used only as a last resort as required by the local policy.
- 1.58 There were plans to introduce limb restraints for use with self-harmers. There was a danger that too much emphasis was being placed on physical methods to prevent self-harm in the short-term rather than on individual staff interaction to support prisoners through a crisis.
- 1.59 A Listener Scheme had been established since our last inspection. There was a group of eight Listeners – four of whom had only recently completed training. There were difficulties in retaining Listeners – two had been due for transfer. There was no Listener working in reception although some were based in Bann House, the first night location for most new committals, and they participated in prisoners’ induction. They were used at night throughout the main prison, but there were no Listeners in the Mourne House complex nor were there dedicated rooms for use by Listeners. They felt largely supported by staff and the Samaritans, but did not attend monthly strategic safer custody meetings.

Recommendations

- 1.60 **Managers should conduct rigorous audits of action plans following investigations on deaths and near fatal incidents to be assured that required actions are in place.**
- 1.61 **SPAR procedures should be improved with a particular focus on case management and reviews.**
- 1.62 **The strategic safer custody meeting should monitor the use of observation cells and strip clothing to ensure their use is always necessary and proportionate.**
- 1.63 **The Listener Scheme should be extended to the Mourne House complex.**



Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

The prison promotes the welfare of prisoners, particularly adults at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.⁴

- 1.64 A vulnerable prisoners policy had been introduced but was not fully embedded. Many of the most vulnerable prisoners were located or supported on the Donard Landing and Day Centre which were excellent initiatives.
- 1.65 A vulnerable prisoner's policy had been introduced in February 2012 but was not embedded across the prison. The policy contained no reference to consent issues, best interests or the rights of prisoners to make unwise decisions. Most staff were not aware of any particular procedure to which they could refer.
- 1.66 The Donard Landing and the Donard Day Centre were good resources providing vulnerable prisoners with support and activity. Many of the prisoners had poor mental health, personality disorders, were at risk of self-harm or were reluctant to associate out of their cell. A total of 18 prisoners were allocated a cell on the Donard Landing (in Foyle House) but others attended the Day Centre from other Units. Prisoners reported positive outcomes and relationships with the specially selected and trained staff. A range of therapeutic sessions were provided and prisoners said that they felt safe in the centre. Prisoners could refer themselves to the programme. The number of prisoners involved had risen over recent months – currently there were 50. This was a considerable improvement on the former REACH Landing of which we were previously critical.
- 1.67 Inspectors noted that a recent incident in Donard Landing, which saw two prisoners make allegations to prison staff, had not been investigated until the matter had been raised by Inspectors. Inspectors were therefore not fully assured that prompt and appropriate action had been taken following the allegation or suspicion of abuse.
- 1.68 There was some evidence that individual plans were in place to support assessed needs. However these addressed general vulnerable prisoner issues rather than specific risks. Mental health staff indicated that custody staff would know when to refer a prisoner to them.

Recommendation

- 1.69 **Arrangements for safeguarding vulnerable prisoners should be strengthened and reflect regional guidance.**

⁴ We define an adult at risk as a vulnerable person aged 18 years or over; 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'. 'No secrets' definition (Department of Health 2000).



Security

Expected outcomes:

Security and good order are maintained through an attention to physical and procedural matters, including effective security intelligence as well as positive staff-prisoner relationships. Prisoners are safe from exposure to substance misuse while in prison.

- 1.70 Physical security arrangements were too restrictive, but good progress had been made in some areas. Dynamic security was not adequate but had improved. Changes to the practices of the Dedicated Search Team (DST) had been positive, but further monitoring and review was necessary. Security arrangements on the separated units were overly restrictive. Prisoners testing positive for drugs were referred to drug services but it was inappropriate that the progressive regimes and earned privileges (PREPS) was linked to drug testing. The Mandatory Drug Testing (MDT) suite was not fit for purpose.
- 1.71 Physical security was overly restrictive, particularly in the two separated units (see below), but there had been very positive progress towards a more proportionate approach in the main part of the prison. While physical resources, including the excessive use of electronic doors and turnstiles controlled by staff in isolated pods on each wing, remained oppressive, some security arrangements and processes had been suitably relaxed.
- 1.72 The most notable was the new free flow arrangement that allowed unrestricted movement throughout core hours of the day for all but a few prisoners. Another example was the change in labour allocation and temporary release boards procedures. The Security Department now only fed information into the process, with the final decision resting with the chair of each board, rather than, as under the previous arrangement, security staff being able to veto any decision.
- 1.73 Dynamic security was not operating adequately, but had improved in line with increased staff-prisoner contact and improving staff-prisoner relationships. Security information report submissions had doubled since the previous inspection, with an average of just over 100 per month over the previous 12 months. However, there were no trained security analysts; action taken as a result of security intelligence was reactive with an insufficient focus on identifying ongoing security objectives.
- 1.74 A Security Committee had only been set up in recent months. Attendance was inconsistent, but it was positive that Managers from all departments were invited.
- 1.75 Decisions to place prisoners on closed visits continued to be made at headquarters level and only occurred when a prisoner was involved in an incident directly related to visits, for example, trafficking or inappropriate behaviour.
- 1.76 The previously disproportionate and pernicious influence of the DST had been reduced. Not only had the size of the team been reduced from 40 to 22, but it was no longer a separate entity with no oversight, having been better integrated into the security function.
- 1.77 We shadowed a group of DST staff undertaking target searching and observed noticeable differences in approach compared with previous inspections. Wing staff were no longer required to hand over control of the wing and only the landing where the searching was taking place was cleared of any unlocked prisoners. Prisoners were searched respectfully and their cells were left in their original state; this was later confirmed by prisoners as typical.



- 1.78 However, continued managerial monitoring and review of the DST remained an imperative, for example, in relation to use of force (see section on use of force) and separated units (see below).
- 1.79 Security arrangements on the separated units remained overly restrictive. No more than three prisoners were unlocked on each landing at any one time. This seemed particularly unnecessary in Bush House, where there had been no major incident for over two years. In Roe House, a large group of separated prisoners had been on a dirty protest for some time. They reported that one of the major concerns linked to the protest was searching arrangements. They were rub down searched every time they left cells to shower and then again when they left the shower. We were told by Managers that this was happening because there had been assaults on staff using excrement. At the time of the incidents, five months earlier, this approach had been merited. However, there had been no attempt to de-escalate searches since then. The subsequent search on leaving showers regardless of the circumstances was superfluous.
- 1.80 The searching arrangements for prisoners leaving both separated units were also unnecessary. They were taken by van to a portacabin where the DST staff carried out rub down searches and searches using a metal detector wand and a body orifice security scanner chair. Time and resources could have been saved by simply having wing staff use metal detector wands and carry out rub down searches as prisoners left the wing, without compromising the level of security.
- 1.81 A form of MDT was introduced in October 2010. The premise was not to deal with test failures punitively in the first instance, but instead to offer prisoners help with drug problems. All prisoners with positive drug tests were therefore referred to *Ad:ept* and/or the clinical team. Despite this positive drug tests were linked to the PREPS and often resulted in a downgrading which was counter to the premise of it not having a punitive focus. However with the long waiting lists for each service, it was virtually impossible for support and treatment to be offered to those in the greatest need and at the highest risk of further relapse.
- 1.82 The average positive random rate across the six months from September 2011 to February 2012 was 11.3%, which, while on the one hand gave a good indication of the extent of the availability of opiates and benzodiazepines, did not reflect the additional availability of other prescribed drugs like tramadol, pregabalin or gabapentin, which the MDT testing panel did not detect. Our survey revealed that 38% of prisoners in the main prison, compared with 29% in local comparator prisons, thought it was easy or very easy to get drugs in Maghberry. During the same period, 92 suspicion tests had been conducted with a positive rate of 36.9%.
- 1.83 The MDT suite was located in a toilet designed for use by disabled people. The toilet had a clear glass door, and although a hospital screen could be pulled across, the room was very small. The presence of a wide range of potential contaminants, including a chemical waste bin located directly adjacent to the toilet bowl, made it unsuitable as a forensic testing environment.

Recommendations

- 1.84 **Security arrangements for prisoners on separated units, including searching, should be based on regularly reviewed individual risk assessments.**
- 1.85 **Intelligence analysts within the security function should be provided with appropriate training.**
- 1.86 **MDT facilities should be moved to a more suitable location to ensure that the environment is respectful and suitable for forensic testing.**



Progressive regimes and earned privileges

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.87 Many prisoners were demoted to the basic privilege level for minor infringements, mostly unrelated to patterns of poor behaviour, and remained there for too long. They did however have access to a good regime.
- 1.88 In our survey, fewer prisoners than in comparator prisons felt that the PREPS had been applied fairly to them and this was even lower for Roman Catholic and foreign national prisoners.
- 1.89 The PREPS was explained to prisoners on induction and reinforced through the prisoner information booklet and notices. The scheme had three incentive levels – basic, standard and enhanced – and although there was little significant differential between the levels, it was inappropriate that prisoners employed in the same activity received a different level of pay depending on their privilege level.
- 1.90 Prisoners were required to show three months' good behaviour to qualify for the enhanced level, but many waited significantly longer.
- 1.91 Demotions to the basic level generally took place after two adverse reports within a three-month period, but records we sampled reflected that these were mostly for minor infringements and not following a pattern of poor behaviour.
- 1.92 At the time of the inspection, 32 prisoners were on the basic level, often for relatively minor infringements, which was higher than we normally see. All remained on it for a minimum of 28 days regardless of improvements in their behaviour, which was unnecessarily punitive (see section on security). This was mitigated slightly by reasonably good access to a range of activities and televisions, but it was inappropriate that telephone credit was restricted.
- 1.93 The scheme was not used as a motivational tool to effect necessary changes in behaviour. Action plans for those on the basic level were not always completed, but when they were, targets were mostly perfunctory and unrelated to the initial reason for the demotion.

Recommendation

- 1.94 **The PREPS should be re-focused so that it provides incentives and rewards for good behaviour rather than being overly focused on the punitive consequences of poor behaviour. Prisoners should receive equal pay when in the same jobs regardless of their privilege level.**



Disciplinary procedures

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.

1.95 Adjudications were generally appropriately raised and fairly dealt with, but some punishments were too severe. There was no coherent strategy to reduce the number of adjudications due to the absence of the routine trend analysis of associated data. Most use of force appeared necessary and lawful, although there were examples where de-escalation was not being employed. There was a lack of governance and embryonic analysis required improvement. The governance and monitoring arrangements for the use of special accommodation was potentially dangerous. The segregation unit was generally a decent environment for short stay prisoners, but we had concerns for those remaining for longer periods.

Adjudications

- 1.96 The average monthly total number of adjudications for the six month period before the inspection was 126, compared with 94 for the same timescale at the previous inspection. Most of this increase could be attributed to the 26% rise in population and a brief, sharp rise due to dirty protests undertaken by prisoners in Roe House. Most adjudications examined had been appropriately raised, although a few could have been more appropriately dealt with through the local PREPS.
- 1.97 An extremely high proportion of prisoners found guilty (37%) had received punishments of cellular confinement, and our sampling indicated that this was too punitive, especially for lesser charges. Punishments, such as losing access to the telephone or to the facility to purchase telephone credit, as well as to reading and writing materials – in other words preventing contact with family and friends – were inappropriate.
- 1.98 Hearings continued to be tape recorded rather than written; those that we sampled and observed showed that there had been reasonable enquiry. Quality assurance arrangements involved routine examination of the previous month's records, with issues identified and submitted to the governor via a written briefing. However, scrutiny focused only on equality and diversity issues and the appropriateness and consistency of punishment, with little attention to the quality of hearings.
- 1.99 No adjudication standardisation meetings were held. This meant that data, such as, the total number of adjudications by location, offence and officer raising the charge, was not collated and analysed. Patterns and trends were therefore not available to inform the strategy aimed at reducing adjudication levels.

The use of force

- 1.100 There had been 191 incidents involving the use of force over the past year (not including close escort supervision and strip searches on resisting separated prisoners leaving and entering the prison). This compared with 171 over the same period at the previous inspection. Proportionately, this represented a slight decrease in such incidents, as there had been a 27% rise in the population since then.
- 1.101 Governance and monitoring arrangements were weak. Governors were required to scrutinise and sign off on all submitted officer accounts, but sampling indicated that this occurred rarely. The Use of Force Committee had only recently reconvened following a gap of at least a year. Only security staff attended; analysis of data was limited and minutes revealed that trends were insufficiently identified and there were no associated action points.

- 
- 1.102 Officers had completed records reasonably well, with the large majority providing sufficient detail regarding why force had been employed, although evidence of attempts to de-escalate their actions were not always reported, where accounts suggested it might have been possible.
- 1.103 Few staff outside the DST had received full control and restraint (C&R) training. This meant that whenever a prisoner had to be relocated as a result of an incident, DST staff always took over from the staff initially involved in restraining the prisoner. This de-skilled staff outside the DST and reinforced the intimidating reputation of the DST amongst both staff and prisoners.
- 1.104 Planned interventions were all routinely recorded, but were not reviewed by senior managers. Those that we viewed were efficiently organised, but were heavy-handed in approach. One example involved a prisoner being relocated to a ligature-free cell from unfurnished accommodation in the segregation unit. Full personal protective clothing was used by all staff, inexplicably including the supervising officer, and a dog was present on scene, both of which were disproportionate. Although initially compliant, force was used when the prisoner refused to change into strip-proof clothing and, when he pleaded with staff to stop and allow him to change clothes himself, there were no attempts at de-escalation.
- 1.105 Arrangements for the use and governance of special accommodation were inadequate. Accurate data relating to the use of special accommodation was not available. Authorisation paperwork was not automatically raised when prisoners were initially relocated in one of the unfurnished cells in the segregation unit. Managers reported that such paperwork was initiated when the prisoner had been there 'for an hour or two'. However, we found several examples where authorisation paperwork had not been completed at all, the most extreme example being for a prisoner who had been in one of the cells for seven days on a dirty protest.
- 1.106 Even when authorisation was in evidence, monitoring arrangements were wholly inadequate, with routine observations occurring hourly unless otherwise stipulated by any SPAR arrangements the prisoner might have been subject to.

Segregation

- 1.107 The general environment of the Segregation Unit, known locally as the Care and Separation Unit (CSU) was clean. The condition of cells was mixed; those on the ground floor were in a poor state of repair and some lacked items of furniture, particularly cupboards, which meant prisoners stored their clothes in bags or simply on the floor. Those on the upper floor were in much better condition and were fully furnished.
- 1.108 Prisoners were no longer routinely strip searched when they were relocated to the Unit and were given one-to-one interviews as part of an induction process. However, there were no requirements to carry out an initial safety screen to determine if segregation was suitable and safe, a source of concern, particularly as prisoners subject to SPAR arrangements were often relocated to the Unit.
- 1.109 Prisoners were positive when they reported their treatment by staff and we observed relaxed and professional interactions, including the use of first names by both staff and prisoners when addressing each other. Unfortunately, this was not reflected in daily wing file entries, which were perfunctory and focused on behaviour and compliance.
- 1.110 The regime for prisoners who had been segregated in the short-term for reasons of good order or for their own protection (under rule 32) and for prisoners under punishment of cellular confinement was reasonable. All had daily access to showers and the telephone, an hour in the small exercise yard – this



could be in association subject to a risk assessment – and daily access to the Unit’s gym facilities. Except for those who had adjudication punishments of withdrawn privileges, they retained all previously allocated in-possession items and were provided with a television.

- 1.111 However, this regime was wholly inadequate for those prisoners remaining in the Unit for longer periods, the longest at the time of the inspection being 15 months. Although they had access to evening association, it was usually in isolation due to the risk posed by other prisoners. In-cell education provision was sporadic owing to limited teaching resources. Mental health support was only available every two to three weeks.
- 1.112 Bi-weekly multi-disciplinary review boards were convened to assess suitability for continued segregation, but they were not effective because only a senior manager from headquarters could authorise continued segregation with reference to only brief notes from the board. Segregation Unit managers had attempted to establish a separate multi-disciplinary care planning process, but this had been undermined by a lack of attendance from anyone outside the Unit, resulting in a complete absence of reintegration planning.

Recommendations

- 1.113 **All uniform staff should be trained in full control and restraint techniques.**
- 1.114 **All records, including video recordings, relating to use of force for reasons of non-compliance should be routinely reviewed by a senior manager to ensure force is necessary and lawful.**
- 1.115 **Cellular confinement should only be used for the most serious offences, and punishments that impede or prevent contact with the outside world should not be used.**
- 1.116 **Prisoners should only be located in special accommodation on the written authority of a senior manager, and should be relocated to mainstream accommodation as soon as the initial reasons for its use are no longer applicable.**
- 1.117 **An effective multi-disciplinary care and reintegration planning process should be implemented to help prevent the psychological deterioration of prisoners subject to long periods in the Segregation Unit.**
- 1.118 **Senior managers should routinely monitor and analyse a range of data across all three discipline areas – adjudications, use of force and segregation – in order to direct and improve strategic management of these areas.**



Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners with drug and/or alcohol problems are identified at reception and receive effective treatment and support throughout their stay in custody.

- 1.119 Staffing levels were low and waiting lists for clinical opiate substitution were very long. Prisoners were therefore often detoxified against their will, prior to initiation on to opiate substitutes. Symptomatic relief and other medication that could easily be misused were dispensed weekly in-possession. Clinical reviews were not completed on time and never involved psychosocial workers. Alcohol detoxification procedures posed significant risks to prisoners.
- 1.120 At the time of the inspection, 35 men were receiving opiate substitution treatment. This was very low for a busy local prison; in our survey 29% of prisoners in the main prison compared with 36% in comparator prisons said that they had a drug problem on arrival. The low number of prisoners in treatment appeared, however, also to be as a result of low staffing levels; the two-nurse Addiction Team also provided services at Magilligan and Hydebank Wood prisons. This resulted in very long waits for clinical assessments and initiation on to substitution treatment.
- 1.121 Prisoners were screened in reception by primary health care staff and then referred to the Addiction Team if necessary. Prisoners arriving with existing confirmed prescriptions for opiate substitution continued on medication without delay. Prisoners who required initiation, however, were given symptomatic relief; they then had to wait for an initial triage assessment by an addiction nurse.
- 1.122 Symptomatic relief medication was dispensed in possession every week. Some prisoners who were experiencing severe withdrawal symptoms told us that they had used up a week's supply of medication in as little as two days, which then caused problems when they returned to health care to request more medication.
- 1.123 Prisoners were triaged by an addictions nurse according to a risk assessment and their level of need. They were then placed on to another waiting list to see the clinical psychiatrist who attended the prison for just one or, at the most, two sessions a week. At the time of the inspection, 46 prisoners were on this waiting list; 11 waiting prisoners were designated the highest priority by the triage process. One man that we spoke with had already been waiting 14 days to be seen. He was in a highly distressed state and there was a significant risk of self-harm. He told us that he regularly used five bags of heroin a day prior to his arrest. However, his subsequent opiate tolerance would have diminished to virtually zero in the 14 days that he had been in prison. He told us that he was neither emotionally nor physically ready to remain abstinent. He was therefore at a high risk of opiate overdose should he have used them illicitly.
- 1.124 With such long waits, many prisoners had completely overcome physical withdrawals and had often effectively been detoxified against their will by the time they had had a full clinical assessment. During the wait for assessment, prisoners were required to produce up to two urine samples to demonstrate levels of opiate present. Many prisoners that we spoke to believed that these tests had to prove negative before they would be initiated on to opiate substitutes, although staff told us that this was not the case.
- 1.125 Any subsequent initiations on to opiate substitution treatment for these prisoners therefore amounted to 'retoxification' – a procedure that should normally be reserved for the most chaotic of prisoners nearing their release date. Other prisoners who had been waiting for heroin substitution assessments and treatment had resorted to continued self-medication with illicit drugs or diverted prescription drugs, which were readily available throughout the prison.



- 1.126 Ninety per cent of all medication, including drugs that were the most easily misused, like tramadol, pregabalin, gabapentin, diazepam and co-codamol, were dispensed in weekly-possession. Approximately a quarter of the prison population, 237 prisoners, were on diazepam reduction programmes and their medication was dispensed every week in-possession. (See section on the pharmacy.)
- 1.127 We were concerned that Subutex could also be easily diverted. During opiate substitution administration, prisoners receiving Subutex sub-lingual lozenges were observed for an average of only two minutes, whereas most Subutex administration guidance recommends a 10 minute observed dissolve time.
- 1.128 We were disappointed that staff could not tell us how many prisoners were either on maintenance or reduction doses, indicating a lack of focus on the principle of recovery in the prison's clinical approach to drug treatment. This view was reinforced when we found that three-monthly clinical reviews were not always conducted on time and never involved the prisoner's psychosocial *Ad:ept* worker.
- 1.129 In our survey 33% of prisoners on the main site said they had a problem with alcohol on arrival, which was significantly more than in comparator prisons where there was a rate of 26%. Alcohol detoxification was delivered under the remit of primary health care rather than the Addictions Team. Most cases were located on the wings due to the lack of in-patient beds. All alcohol detoxification patients were frequently given chlordiazepoxide in-possession and were therefore not seen by health care staff on a daily basis. The lack of clinical support on the wings and the fact that many prisoners did not adhere to the stated dosage levels and were running out of medication ahead of the expected refill date, all meant that the regime was potentially unsafe.
- 1.130 Where prisoners had alcohol detoxification and other drug use needs, their substance use care was divided between three departments if they were also receiving psychosocial support. This was at best confusing for prisoners and, given the poor communication between staff in the three departments and lack of joint reviews, counter-productive.
- 1.131 'Silo working' had resulted in an absence of integrated care planning between clinical and psychosocial workers. Low staffing levels and long waiting lists were causing frustration and disillusionment with the treatment among prisoners and, as one prisoner put it, "*the whole system [at Maghaberry] is enabling the dealers and bullies to profit from diverted medication, and does not support those of us who want to get straight.*"
- 1.132 Tests, immunisation or treatment for blood-borne viruses were only offered to intravenous drug users.

Recommendations

- 1.133 **Alcohol detoxification procedures should be reviewed to ensure that prisoners have adequate clinical support and access to necessary medication.**
- 1.134 **A prison-wide blood-borne virus clinic should be established, offering appropriate tests, immunisation and treatment options to all prisoners.**

Housekeeping point

- 1.135 *Prisoners should be made fully aware of the requirements for pre-treatment urine tests.*



Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 The standard of cleanliness throughout the residential areas was mostly good. More than 50% of prisoners shared cells designed for one prisoner, which were too cramped. Access to cleaning materials and personal laundry facilities were good. Telephone access and mail procedures were good, but it took too long to answer requests.
- 2.2 The standard of cleanliness in and around the prison was good. Regular recorded inspections of residential areas were carried out by members of the senior management team, who gave in-depth feedback to unit managers. Outside areas were being improved with planting and art work, but exercise yards were mostly small and too austere.
- 2.3 Arrangements to manage the environmental cleanliness and infection prevention and control in the long running dirty protest by prisoners on Roe House had been externally monitored by CJI and RQIA and deemed adequate at the time of the unannounced inspections.
- 2.4 At the time of our inspection more than 50% of prisoners (538) were sharing cells designed for one person; these were cramped and not fit for purpose. One hundred and fifteen unconvicted prisoners were sharing cells with convicted prisoners on six different residential units, which was not appropriate.
- 2.5 Most cells had lockable cabinets and longer-term prisoners in single cells had their own privacy keys. Residential units were quiet and calm at night, although prisoners located near to special cells in Bann House and Lagan House complained that they were often disturbed by noise.
- 2.6 In our survey, 99% of prisoners in the Mourne House complex and 92% in the main prison said that they had access to a shower every day. Some showers were not screened and baths in the old 'square houses' could not be used in private.
- 2.7 Access to cleaning materials was good, but colour coded mops were being stored together in ablution areas with the potential for cross-contamination. Prisoners on all wings had access to a personal laundry service at least once a week. Bedding and clothing issued by the prison was in a good state of repair and could be exchanged at least on a weekly basis. All prisoners could wear their own clothing.
- 2.8 Large serveries and dining areas with new bench tables and chairs had become redundant, as prisoners ate meals in their cells.



- 2.9 Prisoners submitted an application to obtain items from their stored property but were not allowed to attend reception in person. In our survey, only 26% of prisoners (25% in the Mourne House complex) said they could access their stored property if they needed to. This was a significant decrease compared with 38% and 41% respectively since our last full inspection.
- 2.10 There were enough telephones for prisoners to use except in the Foyle Unit. However not all telephones could be used in private, and those in recreation rooms often had excessive background noise from televisions. Mail procedures were satisfactory.
- 2.11 Of the prisoners in the main prison who completed our survey, 41% said that their cell bell was normally answered within five minutes; for prisoners in the Mourne House complex, this was 32%. Prisoners in groups told us that bells were answered quickly during the day but not at night.
- 2.12 Cell Sharing Risk Assessments (CSRA) were completed for all new receptions. There was a comprehensive policy relating to CSRAs, but only 38 staff had been trained in the procedure since October 2011. It was a concern that CSRAs were not always reviewed following significant incidents such as assaults or fights.
- 2.13 Prisoners could easily submit requests, which were recorded and tracked. Responses in email format were printed and handed to prisoners. In the six months from September 2011 to February 2012, 69.5% of requests had not been answered on time.

Recommendations

- 2.14 **Cells designed for one prisoner should not be shared and unconvicted prisoners should not be required to share cells with convicted prisoners.**
- 2.15 **Suitable storage areas should be provided for mops and buckets, and staff and prisoners responsible for cleaning should be appropriately trained.**
- 2.16 **Telephones should have a privacy hood or booth, and noise from televisions in recreation rooms where telephones are located, should not be excessive.**
- 2.17 **Managers should satisfy themselves that cell bells are receiving a response within five minutes during the day and at night.**
- 2.18 **Staff responsible for CSRAs should be trained in their use. CSRAs should be reviewed routinely following significant incidents.**
- 2.19 **Prisoners' formal requests should receive a response within seven working days as outlined in the prison's policy.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.20 *Exercise areas should be less austere and include seating as a minimum.*
- 2.21 *Lockable cabinets should be fitted in all cells.*
- 2.22 *Missing shower curtains should be replaced and baths should be screened.*
- 2.23 *Prisoners should be encouraged to eat out of their cells.*



Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are treated with respect by staff throughout the duration of their time in custody, and are encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions.

- 2.24 Relationships between staff and prisoners were much improved since our last inspection, but interaction with prisoners during association was limited. Entries in wing files were mostly limited to observed behaviour to inform the incentives process. There was no personal officer scheme, but there were regular prisoner consultations in house blocks.
- 2.25 Most landing staff were friendly, but there was little supportive and active engagement with prisoners. In our survey, 81% of prisoners on the main site and 79% in the Mourne House complex said that staff treated them with respect, a significant improvement on 73% at both sites since our last inspection. Staff routinely addressed prisoners by their first or preferred names.
- 2.26 There was no personal officer scheme and most wing staff did not contribute to sentence planning or submit entries about prisoners on the prison's computer system. Entries in wing files were mostly about observed behaviour to inform the incentives process. It was a concern that when significant information relating to a prisoner was received it was rarely recorded in their wing files or the wing journal. Only 35% of prisoners at the main site and 30% in the Mourne House complex who completed our survey said that a member of staff had personally checked on them in the past week to see how they were getting on.
- 2.27 There was little informal staff interaction with prisoners and only 22% of prisoners in our survey said that staff normally spoke to them most or all of the time during association. Association was not supervised in some areas of the prison (see violence reduction section).
- 2.28 Prisoner consultation meetings were held regularly, but minutes were not displayed in residential units.

Recommendations

- 2.29 **A personal officer scheme should be implemented in all residential units and wing staff should contribute to sentence planning.**
- 2.30 **Significant information relating to prisoners should be recorded in wing files, prison computer files and in the wing journal.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.31 *Terms of reference should be established for prisoner forums and minutes of meetings should be put on display in residential areas.*



Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and co-ordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, whilst ensuring that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of those outlined in Section 75 groupings⁵ are recognised and addressed; these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

2.32 Leadership and commitment to the development of diversity and equality was good, but further development was required. The Equality Committee was given a high priority and was well attended. Prisoner representatives only attended the first part of the meeting. A considerable amount of data was collated and identified repeated inequalities for Roman Catholic prisoners, particularly where staff discretion was applied. This had been insufficiently explored, responses lacked sophistication and did not adequately address unequal treatment. With the exception of foreign national prisoners, there were no support groups or forums for minority groups of prisoners. The UK Border Agency support for foreign national prisoners was insufficient, but interpretation services were mostly appropriately used. Assessments and individual support for older prisoners and those with disabilities required improvement. Support for gay or bisexual prisoners was insufficient.

Strategic management

- 2.33 Equality and diversity provision was developing. There was a generic overarching strategy, which did not specify all the different groups (referred to in HMIP expectations as protected characteristics) covered under Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998. This was not specific to provision at Maghaberry Prison.
- 2.34 Strong leadership led the commitment to drive the equality agenda, but progress had been slow and further development was required. A significant majority of staff had not completed any equality and diversity awareness training.
- 2.35 The Equality Committee met monthly, was chaired by the deputy governor and constituted appropriately. Prisoner equality representatives attended only a part of the meeting. Minutes did not assure us that all protected characteristics were fully discussed. The Committee considered a wide range of data that focused on monitoring access and treatment according to religion. The inequalities relating to Roman Catholic prisoners were repeatedly identified across a range of areas, particularly where staff discretion was applied, including access to better accommodation, the increased use of force and adjudications, and the use of segregation. Despite this, there was insufficient exploration and the response to identified inequalities lacked sophistication.
- 2.36 There was no separate complaints process for equality and diversity issues, but complaints were monitored for race and disability discrimination issues and those sampled had been adequately investigated. Equality impact assessments had been completed inadequately.
- 2.37 The seven equality prisoner representatives had received some diversity awareness training but were unclear as to what their role entailed. Despite this, they felt that their views were being taken into

⁵ Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998.



account but that they were not representative of the wider prison population. With the exception of foreign national prisoners, there were no support groups or forums for prisoners from minority groups.

Recommendations

- 2.38 **There should be an equality and diversity policy specific to Maghaberry Prison that meets the requirements of anti-discrimination legislation and outlines how the needs of all minority groups will be met.**
- 2.39 **The standard of equality impact assessments should be improved.**
- 2.40 **Support groups and forums should be available for all minority groups and should be accessible to all prisoners from those minorities.**

Protected characteristics

- 2.41 There were 63 prisoners from a black and minority ethnic background, including 17 from the Gypsy, Romany and Traveller Community. We observed reasonable relationships between staff and the black and minority ethnic prisoners, and those we spoke with also described reasonable treatment.
- 2.42 Just under 10% of the population were foreign national prisoners and at the time of inspection none were held solely under immigration powers. Foreign national prisoners were identified effectively and had reasonable contact with the foreign national officer, but no records of contact were maintained. Records assured us that interpretation services were widely and mostly appropriately used. Some staff told us that they preferred to rely on prisoner interpreters as this was easier than accessing telephone interpretation services, but this was inappropriate for some matters that required confidentiality.
- 2.43 Foreign national prisoners reported more negatively across a number of indicators in our survey. They told us that they were frustrated by the lack of contact with the UK Border Agency; representatives from the Agency attended the prison infrequently and this appeared insufficient to meet the needs of the population. Visits from consulates for individual nationalities were positive but too inconsistent, as were specific support groups and forums for foreign national prisoners.
- 2.44 There was a good range of foreign language publications in the library. Arrangements for access to free telephone calls to enable foreign national prisoners to maintain family ties were applied inconsistently. Classes in English for speakers of other languages were highly regarded and accessed by a large number of prisoners.
- 2.45 The individual needs of older prisoners or those with disabilities were insufficiently identified or assessed. Prisoners we spoke with felt uncared for and, at the time of inspection, there were no individual support plans for these prisoners. We were not assured that all prisoners who needed Personal Emergency Evacuation Plans (PEEPs) had details of them and not all staff were aware of them. There was no paid carer scheme. Some accommodation had been identified for use by prisoners with disabilities and there was evidence of adjustments around the prison. There were no specific groups, forums or activities to support older prisoners or those with disabilities.
- 2.46 In our survey two per cent of prisoners identified as being gay or bisexual, but the identification of and support for these prisoners were considerably under-developed.



Recommendations

- 2.47 **Records of contact between staff and foreign national prisoners should be maintained and interpretation services should be used for all matters requiring confidentiality.**
- 2.48 **To encourage foreign national prisoners to maintain family ties they should all have access to free telephone calls.**
- 2.49 **UK Border Agency staff should attend the prison and engage with all foreign national prisoners more regularly.**
- 2.50 **Older prisoners and those with disabilities should have individual assessments and where appropriate, individual care or support plans and PEEPs. Specific activities and provisions to support these prisoners should be improved.**
- 2.51 **Support for gay and bisexual prisoners should be improved.**

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.52 A fully integrated Chaplaincy Team played an active and supportive role in the prison. The faith facilities were good and a wide range of services and activities was available. Provision for the small number of Muslim and Buddhist prisoners required improvement.
- 2.53 In our survey, more prisoners said that they saw a member of the chaplaincy on arrival than at comparator prisons, and more said that they could speak to a religious leader.
- 2.54 The diverse Chaplaincy Team was well integrated across the prison. It delivered good provision for most faiths including corporate worship and pastoral care. However, the small number of Buddhist prisoners had been without a faith leader for over a year.
- 2.55 The chapel and multi-faith facilities were welcoming and widely used. A wide programme of study groups and other activities were facilitated.
- 2.56 There was a small number of Muslim prisoners for whom the provision of halal food, religious clothing and dedicated ablutions prior to worship was insufficient.

Recommendation

- 2.57 **Provision for Muslim and Buddhist prisoners should be improved.**



Complaints

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.58 Complaint boxes could not be used confidentially, but most complaints were answered on time and addressed the issues raised. Serious complaints about staff were often poorly investigated at too low a level. More robust monitoring was needed.
- 2.59 Complaint boxes were located by wing offices. This meant that they could not be used confidentially. Boxes were emptied by night managers and complaints scanned on to the intranet. Complainants were interviewed within 24 hours by the wing's senior officer. Responses were typed and printed, which ensured legibility.
- 2.60 Complaints were answered on time and most in a respectful manner. Responses addressed the issues raised. A monthly average of 219 complaints had been made in the first three months of 2012, compared with 287 in 2011. In 2012, most complaints concerned accommodation, followed by property, cash and staff. In 2011 most complaints concerned staff, followed by property and cash.
- 2.61 In our survey, 43% of men in the main prison said that complaints were dealt with fairly and 56% said that they were dealt with quickly, both significantly higher than in the comparator prisons. However 28%, significantly more than the 15% in comparator prisons, said that they had been prevented from making a complaint. Roman Catholic prisoners were less positive than Protestant prisoners, and many prisoners said that complaints had been lost by staff after they had been submitted.
- 2.62 Principal officers monitored complaint numbers every month, by the timeliness of completion and by subject. They audited 10% of complaints, but only by timescales and 'appropriate person' response. There was no recorded monitoring by senior managers of the number of complaints upheld, refused or withdrawn, by the quality of replies or by religion, or any other protected characteristic.
- 2.63 Principal officers and senior managers discussed complaints every week, but meetings were not minuted. However, there was evidence that a governor had carried out an investigation in response to foreign national prisoner complaints and that recommendations for action had been made.
- 2.64 The complaints policy stated that all allegations of assault by staff should be referred initially for investigation to a governor. Although this was often the case, as we reported in 2009, a number of serious complaints about staff, including allegations about searching staff, were answered by senior officers responsible for the staff concerned. Many provided little evidence of thorough investigation. We saw how a senior officer had inappropriately sent a complaint about search staff to the DST 'for clarification'.
- 2.65 Some complaints passed to the police or a governor did not record the outcome of investigations, and no detailed explanations were given regarding the reason behind the withdrawal of complaints.
- 2.66 Prisoner consultation had been introduced only recently and the complaints system was not an agenda item.



2.67 There were ongoing problems with the lack of response to visitor complaints. (See section on reintegration planning.)

Recommendations

- 2.68 **Complaint boxes should be relocated to areas unobserved by wing staff, and complaints should be emptied, recorded and tracked by an administrative member of staff.**
- 2.69 **Senior managers should robustly analyse complaints by the number upheld, refused and withdrawn, by all protected characteristics and by the quality of the response. Any action taken should be recorded.**
- 2.70 **Senior managers should investigate all serious complaints made against staff, quality check all other complaints about staff, and ensure that the reasons for the withdrawal of complaints are fully recorded.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.71 *The outcome of complaints should be recorded in all instances.*
- 2.72 *Prisoners should be consulted about the complaints system.*

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are fully aware of, and understand their sentence or remand, both on arrival and release. Prisoners are supported by the prison staff to freely exercise their legal rights.

- 2.73 Prisoners were provided with limited information about legal services in general, and bail information was inconsistent. Access to legal visits was adequate.
- 2.74 There were no trained legal services officers and bail information services were inadequate. Prisoners complained that the service was inconsistent and usually poor. In our survey, only 32% of respondents in the main prison and 14% in the Mourne House complex said that they could get bail information.
- 2.75 There was limited published information for prisoners, and we observed that staff were generally unable to offer any advice or signposting to services. There was little information in the induction programme about access to legal services, but good legal reference materials were available in the library.
- 2.76 Access to legal visits was good and facilities to have them in private were adequate.

Recommendation

- 2.77 **Information about legal services, particularly bail information, should be made available to prisoners.**



Health services

Expected outcomes:

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

2.78 Partnership arrangements were not working effectively, and there was no health needs assessment to influence service provision. Senior management teams were almost in place but delivery of patient care was hampered by a lack of staff. There was no monitoring of the equity of access to services, nurse led life-long condition clinics occurred rarely and there was no central management of waiting lists. Referral to secondary services was problematic. There were major issues with medicines management. Mental health services had improved but there was still no group work for patients.

Governance arrangements

- 2.79 Health services were provided by the SEHSCT. A commissioning statement of intent had been completed, however the draft prison health care strategy (2010-15) had not been finalised. Work had commenced on a health needs assessment, but this was not yet influencing the services delivered. Joint clinical and social care governance arrangements between the NIPS and the SEHSCT needed further development.
- 2.80 Organisational systems and a governance framework had been developed. A senior management team was being finalised to drive improvement. Staff recruitment had been embargoed until mid-February 2012 and vacancies were covered by agency and bank staff. We were told that nurses had just been recruited and would begin employment soon. We were told by managers that service delivery had been affected by these shortages, staff taking early departure packages and increased prisoner numbers.
- 2.81 Some patient safety issues were of concern and lessons had not been learned from previous incidents regarding the storage of substances hazardous to health and unauthorised access to the medication. Ligature risk assessments needed to be reviewed and action taken on identified risks.
- 2.82 There was a good staff appraisal system. However clinical supervision was poor and not all staff had completed mandatory training over the past 12 months – this included a lack of appropriate training in resuscitation skills.
- 2.83 Liaison with relevant agencies in the management of communicable diseases was good. Monitoring arrangements for infection prevention and control and environmental cleanliness were not effective, and personal protective equipment was not always available. Schedules for cleaning patient equipment were not detailed. The health care facilities, fixtures and fittings were, in some cases, in need of repair or replacement.
- 2.84 Information sharing protocols with appropriate agencies had not been fully developed to ensure efficient and confidential sharing of relevant information.
- 2.85 We noted that the frequency of checks on resuscitation equipment varied. Defibrillators were wall mounted and easily accessible in the majority of areas, but in two areas, they were locked in the medical room and prison officers could not access them. On one occasion a nurse and, during a night visit, a prison officer were unable to locate the defibrillator.



- 2.86 Within health care, a 'key and associate worker' concept was in place and there was evidence of some good staff interactions with prisoners, and first names were being used.
- 2.87 A dedicated nurse was responsible for the care of older prisoners. An occupational therapist had been appointed and a range of mobility aids and equipment was available, although small items such as adapted cutlery were not readily supplied.
- 2.88 A health care leaflet explaining how to access services was provided on committal. This was easy to understand and available in a wide range of languages.
- 2.89 The inspection indicated that there was no local review of health complaints to identify trends and patterns. A random sample of complaints examined, suggested that these were being dealt with promptly.

Recommendations

- 2.90 **The health needs assessment should be completed as a matter of priority and used to drive improvements in joint working relationships and organisational objectives.**
- 2.91 **There should be effective management of patient safety issues such as the storage of substances hazardous to health.**
- 2.92 **Potentially dangerous ligature points in the health care department should be identified and where possible removed, or if this is not feasible, the risks effectively managed.**
- 2.93 **Defibrillators should, in all cases, be easily accessible to trained staff.**
- 2.94 **Effective arrangements should be in place for infection prevention and control and environmental cleanliness.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.95 *Prisoners who have been assessed as requiring aids to assist them on a daily basis should have easy access to them.*

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.96 The initial health screening in reception was too long and cumbersome, resulting in excessive waiting times. If a prisoner arrived out-of-hours, a nurse from the Health Care Unit attended reception and carried out a 'keep safe' assessment (see reception section). Although referrals to other staff were made, there was a heavy reliance on self-referral by prisoners.
- 2.97 In our survey, 33% of prisoners said that it was easy or very easy to see a doctor. The equity of access to services was not monitored. GP clinics took place twice a week in most units and waiting times were not excessive. There were sufficient daily appointments to see the nurse. In an emergency, prisoners could be seen without appointments on landings or in the Health Care Unit. Prisoners who were not seen were allocated an appointment the next day.

- 
- 2.98 Chronic disease management, screening or health promotion clinics were adhoc and depended on staff availability. Some primary care staff were unaware of when clinics were available, and the specialist nurse system was limited. Prisoner support groups were not in place and health promotion information leaflets were only available in the Health Care Unit.
- 2.99 Waiting lists for allied health professionals were not managed centrally. This resulted in delays in accessing appointments and patients were not told how long they might have to wait.
- 2.100 Hepatitis B vaccinations were offered on committal. Routine 'flu vaccination clinics were available. The tetanus vaccine was only offered to intravenous drug users. Barrier protection was not available in the prison.
- 2.101 Admission to the health care ward was not always based on clinical need. There had been several inappropriate placements, which had adversely affected the mental wellbeing of some patients. There was some access to meaningful and constructive activities but the ward resembled an enhanced landing because, at times during the inspection, there were more prison officers than nurses.
- 2.102 Referrals to secondary care services were problematic and not robustly managed. One patient had waited for a surgical appointment since August 2009. The number of escorts available for outside hospital appointments was not sufficient for the size of the population.
- 2.103 The inspection of radiology services in line with the Ionising Radiation (Medical Exposure) Regulations could not be undertaken, as the required documentation and personnel were not available. The inspection will be re-scheduled.

Recommendations

- 2.104 **The current reception screening tool should be shortened and used to identify immediate health care needs.**
- 2.105 **Care of prisoners with lifelong conditions should be provided by nurses with the relevant skills and competency and in line with evidence-based best practice.**
- 2.106 **All waiting lists should be centrally managed and monitored.**
- 2.107 **Admission to the health care ward should be based on clinical need.**
- 2.108 **Prisoners requiring secondary care services should be able to access them without undue restrictions, delays and cancellations.**
- 2.109 **Prisoners should have access to barrier protection.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.110 *All prisoners should have access to relevant immunisations and vaccinations.*



Pharmacy

- 2.111 A local community pharmacy provided the prison pharmacy with supplies. The prison pharmacist provided and reviewed monthly dispensing data. There were quarterly medicines and therapeutics committee meetings. Systems were in place to report incidents involving medication and near misses. Policies, standard operating procedures and patient group directions had been updated; standard operating procedures were only monitored where they related to controlled drugs.
- 2.112 Medicines arrived each day in sealed bags and were transferred to the medical rooms. Medicine cabinets were small and were not secure enough to prevent unauthorised access. The doors to the treatment rooms and drugs refrigerators were unlocked, and some medicines had not been locked away. Medicines for supervised administration were carried in nurses' pockets during evening lockdowns. This was poor practice.
- 2.113 Medication was either supplied weekly or every 28 days, or each dose administered from a hatch under the supervision of a discipline officer. Information leaflets were provided to patients collecting in-possession (IP) medicines, but not to those on supervised medicines.
- 2.114 Medication administration records were not always completed in accordance with legal and professional requirements and did not allow for a clear audit trail.
- 2.115 More than 90% of medicines were prescribed as IP. This in possession policy had been updated in September 2011. Prisoners were individually assessed by a nurse at committal. Subsequent reviews were not recorded and not all risk assessments reflected the prisoners' current administration status.
- 2.116 Not all prisoners had robust lockable containers in which to store in possession medicines securely. The required number of IP checks per month had not been achieved. Checks were not always witnessed by a second member of staff. Medicines which were open to diversion, including diazepam, tramadol, pregabalin and gabapentin, were supplied for weekly in possession. There was no central collation of information. There were no management audits on IP risk assessments and monitoring checks were not carried out. It could not be confirmed that these medicines were not being diverted as the level of monitoring was insufficient (see main recommendation HP96).

Recommendation

- 2.117 **Medicines should be stored safely and securely at all times and administration and disposal records must be accurately maintained.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.118 *Patient information leaflets should be supplied for supervised medicines.*

Dentistry

- 2.119 The nurse or landing prison officer referred prisoners to the dentist and urgent cases were seen where possible on the day of the request. Non-urgent waiting times were up to six months which was far too long.



2.120 An out-of-hours dental service was provided, but had not been used in the past six years. In an emergency, prisoners were taken to hospital.

Recommendation

2.121 **Prisoners should be able to see a dentist for non-urgent treatment within a reasonable timescale.**

Delivery of care (mental health)

2.122 A range of professionals delivered the prison's mental health services. The organisational structure of mental health services had improved but it was too early to judge how this would improve outcomes for prisoners.

2.123 Referrals to the Mental Health Support Team were screened and prioritised at weekly multi-disciplinary team meetings. Only one mental health nurse was dedicated to carry out mental health work. There was usually a three-week wait for an assessment by the Secondary Care Team.

2.124 Prisoners with mental health problems who did not require intervention were not reviewed on a regular basis.

2.125 Prisoners with mental health problems were assessed using the mental state examination, and a brief risk screening tool was used on initial assessment to identify risk. The care plans of prisoners who were being seen by the Mental Health Support Team did not always indicate that prisoners had been involved in developing them, or that an advocate had been offered. Care plans were brief and did not always highlight mental health problems requiring treatment.

2.126 We were told that a comprehensive risk assessment was only completed by the Mental Health Support Team if the patient was a risk to themselves or others.

2.127 Information on transfers to specialist secondary mental health care services was not routinely captured or monitored. Lengthy transfer times under article 52 and 53 of the Mental Health Order could result in treatment being delayed.

Recommendations

2.128 **Prisoners requiring assessment by the Mental Health Team should be seen expeditiously.**

2.129 **Prisoners should be involved in the decisions about their care and treatment; access to an advocate should be provided.**

2.130 **Information relating to transfer director orders should be routinely collected and monitored to ensure that patients are transferred in a timely manner.**



Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.131 We found the range and standard of food to be reasonable but unpopular with prisoners. The main kitchen was clean and well maintained. Meal times were generally reasonably spaced but were served too early in Bann House. The amount of time that cooked food was in transit to the Mourne House complex was excessive. Halal food was not provided.
- 2.132 A single kitchen prepared meals for both the main prison and most of the Mourne House complex. Some prisoners in Wilson Unit in the Mourne House complex were able to prepare their own meals in a small well equipped kitchen located there.
- 2.133 The main kitchen was clean, well maintained and systems to provide a large number of cooked meals on time were organised effectively.
- 2.134 Lunch and dinner were selected from a three-week rolling menu that offered a good variety of healthy options. Menu options included portions of fruit and vegetables every day. There was however, no halal food. Muslim prisoners usually chose vegetarian meals.
- 2.135 The quality of the food we tasted was reasonable and at the correct temperature. Despite this, prisoners continued to report negatively about the food. In our survey, only 15% of respondents in the main prison and a similar percentage at the Mourne House complex said that the food was good.
- 2.136 Meals were delivered on heated trolleys. Temperatures were taken at the time they left the kitchen as well as at the point of serving on the wings. Meal times were generally reasonably spaced, but were served too early in Bann House. The amount of time that food was in transit on heated trolleys to the Mourne House complex was excessive – sometimes more than an hour, and there was some evidence that the quality of the food had deteriorated as a result of having been kept on heated trolleys for too long.
- 2.137 Hotplates on landings and wings throughout the prison were reasonably clean, and supervision during the serving of meals was good in all areas.

Recommendations

- 2.138 **Meal times should be reasonably spaced throughout the prison.**
- 2.139 **Transport arrangements for food to the Mourne House complex should be improved.**



Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

2.140 Most prisoners were positive about shop provision in the survey, but those in the Mourne House complex and foreign national men were less satisfied. The shop was run in-house and easily accessed.

2.141 In our survey 60% of prisoners in the main site said that the shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs, significantly higher than the 46% in comparator prisons. Only 37% of men in the Mourne House complex thought that this was the case, and foreign national men across both sites were less satisfied than others. Many prisoners complained about the cost of goods in comparison to their wages.

2.142 Prisoners could access the shop on arrival, and in the survey, 51% of those in the main site said they had done so, significantly higher than in comparator prisons.

2.143 The shop was run in-house and provided a reasonable range of goods including hobby materials, although some of these were available to sentenced prisoners only. As the service was in-house mistakes were quickly rectified. Information about the shop was only displayed on the wings in English.

2.144 The manager attended the recently introduced prisoner consultative meetings to obtain feedback, and some goods had been added in response to requests from this group.

2.145 Newspapers could be ordered and all prisoners could also order from a limited range of catalogues, although many prisoners found these expensive.

Housekeeping point

2.146 *The dissatisfaction expressed by prisoners in the Mourne House complex should be investigated.*





Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in activities available during unlock, and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied activities.⁶

- 3.1 Time out of cell for prisoners in the Mourne House complex was adequate at about eight hours per day for all prisoners. In the main prison, it was quite poor for those who could not attend activities. We found that the actual experience of individual prisoners varied across the prison. Association was limited for many prisoners, and those not fully employed could on some days receive as little as just three or four hours out of cell.
- 3.2 Time out of cell for prisoners in the Mourne House complex was adequate at about eight hours per day for most prisoners. This included periods of association during the day for prisoners who were not at work. Further periods of exercise offered in the evening were rarely cancelled.
- 3.3 In the main prison, core hours of the day indicated that a fully employed prisoner could achieve about nine hours out of cell Mondays to Fridays and about 6.5 hours at the weekend.
- 3.4 In reality, it was much less for a significant number who did not work or attended part-time activities. Unemployed prisoners, for example, could access nearer to three or four hours with exercise and daily association. Prisoners working part-time were usually locked in their cells while they were not attending activities. There was also 'regime slippage' caused by late unlocking.
- 3.5 At a roll check during the morning of the core day for example, about 30% of the population were locked in their cells. Evening association was offered to prisoners every other day.

Recommendations

- 3.6 **The prison core day should be applied consistently across the prison and prisoners should be out of cell for the maximum amount of time allowed.**
- 3.7 **All prisoners should have access to association in the evening.**

⁶ Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time prisoners are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.



Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners can engage in activities that are purposeful, benefit them and increase their employability. Prisoners are encouraged and enabled to learn both during and after their sentence. The learning and skills and work provision is of a good standard and is effective in meeting the needs of all prisoners.

3.8 Learning and skills provision had improved and operationally was well managed. While an excellent new learning and skills centre had been established, ongoing staffing issues meant that capacity was under utilised and that there was an over-reliance on part-time staff and too few programmes beyond level 2. As a result, the range and breadth of the provision did not meet the needs of the prison population adequately, particularly in vocational training. The quality of teaching, training and learning was mostly good. The curriculum for the essential skills of literacy and numeracy was well developed and the English as a second language (ESOL) provision met the needs of the foreign national prisoners well. The rate of achievement was high for those prisoners who completed their programmes. The provision for physical education was very good. The library provision was good overall but usage rates were too low. There were insufficient purposeful activity places to occupy the prison population and too many prisoners were unemployed. Too few prisoners were employed in appropriately challenging and realistic work activities.

Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work

- 3.9 The levels of interest, motivation and engagement by the prisoners in the lessons and workshop sessions observed were good. It was clear that almost all the prisoners who participated enjoyed their learning experiences. There were high levels of mutual respect between tutors and prisoners, behaviour was good and average attendance, although variable, was reasonable at 70% in education lessons but too low at around 60% in the vocational training sessions.
- 3.10 Good or better standards of work were evident across most of the vocational training programmes and achievement rates on accredited courses were high. The standard of practical work in the workshops was good and the prisoners took pride in the quality of their work. The Braille Transcription and Production Unit provided excellent opportunities for the prisoners to develop unique and transferable skills within a commercial atmosphere. There was good adherence to health and safety across the vocational training provision.
- 3.11 In education, the standard of the prisoners' work was generally good across the range of programmes. There was clear evidence that prisoners were improving their basic literacy and numeracy skills, often from a very low base, and were continuing to make progress up the levels. The achievement rate for those prisoners who completed their essential skills programme was very good at around 90%.

Quality of learning and skills and work provision

- 3.12 An excellent new learning and skills facility had been established, which was bright, contemporary, welcoming and well equipped. There was a positive ethos in the learning and skills centre as demonstrated by the good, supportive relationships between prisoners and staff.
- 3.13 The quality of the teaching, training and learning was generally good during lessons, the vocational workshop and gym sessions observed. In education, the teaching and learning was planned effectively and



generally well balanced with an appropriate mix of explanation, example and suitable activities. However, there was too little use of technology to enhance learning, and the pace of a few of the lessons was too slow. In vocational training, the sessions were also well planned and the instructors supported prisoners well in achieving good standards of finished work. The pace of the training was good, and the prisoners were encouraged to work independently. With the exception of light engineering, the quality of accommodation and standard of equipment across the workshops was good.

- 3.14 The curriculum provision to develop prisoners' essential skills of literacy and numeracy was good, and was well informed by an effective initial assessment process. The planning for learning in the essential skills was effective and underpinned by the good quality individual learning plans, which recorded well the prisoners' prior achievements, any identified barriers to learning and progress made by them in their learning. The pace of progress of some of the prisoners was constrained by the overly wide levels of ability evident in some of the classes, often ranging from pre-entry to level 2. There were innovative initiatives, including an opportunity for the group of prisoners working as education mentors to complete a formal essential skills tutor education qualification. The mentors were used to good effect in the *Toe by Toe* support programme.
- 3.15 The ESOL provision was good. It was proactively led and valued highly by the foreign national prisoners, with around two thirds of them participating.
- 3.16 The prisoners undertaking higher education Open University courses faced too many impediments to their learning and progress, for example, lack of access to appropriate ICT equipment and resources, including the internet. They also had to face long waiting periods when ordering books through the library.
- 3.17 There was insufficient purposeful activity for all the prisoners. The work allocation process covered the key functional areas in the prison and was very prisoner-centred. There were 79 places available in vocational workshops, accounting for around 8% of the prison population. In addition, there were around 290 work activities. Too few prisoners, however, were employed in appropriate work activities. Most of them were employed in a range of orderly job roles across the prison, with too few in challenging, realistic work environments. Not enough of the work activities provided the prisoners with an opportunity to undertake work-related accredited qualifications. Around half of the prisoners were not engaged in regular activities or work during the inspection.
- 3.18 The curriculum for learning and skills was overly narrow and did not match closely local labour market trends and employment opportunities. In vocational training, for example, over half the programmes available were craft-related, and these were only offered up to level 2. With the exception of physical education, there were inadequate progression pathways for the prisoners to provision above level 2. The lack of ICT provision was unsatisfactory and a source of considerable frustration to many prisoners. The range of learning and skills provision for those prisoners who could not access the learning and skills centre was inadequate, in particular for prisoners serving life sentences.
- 3.19 Links with charities and other appropriate outside groups were used well in a small number of vocational training programmes, for example, horticulture, flat-pack furniture production and light engineering. This supported the prisoners' development of enterprise skills and the meeting of real production deadlines. Some prisoners would have benefited from the expansion of projects to promote and develop their commercial enterprise skills.
- 3.20 A good range of recreational courses, some of which were accredited, were offered to the prisoners; most of these were delivered by Prisoner Arts Foundation staff, employed on a part-time basis.



Recommendations

- 3.21 **There should be better support to help Open University students complete their courses.**
- 3.22 **The quality of teaching, training and learning should be improved to ensure it more effectively engages all prisoners, in particular through the better use of technology to support and enhance their learning experiences.**
- 3.23 **Action should be taken to reduce the range of ability levels in the essential skills lessons.**
- 3.24 **The vocational curriculum should be broadened and balanced to include programmes that better match the local labour market trends and employment opportunities.**
- 3.25 **The lack of ICT provision should be addressed as a matter of urgency.**
- 3.26 **There should be more equitable access to education and vocational training programmes for those prisoners who do not have access to the learning and skills centre, in particular for prisoners serving life sentences.**

Leadership and management of learning and skills and work

- 3.27 Learning and skills was an increasing priority in the prison and was well managed. There were effective communication and working relationships with other key functional areas within the prison, such as the Offender Management Unit, the activities and scheduling team and the activity allocation board. Senior managers placed an appropriately strong focus on the prisoners' acquisition and further development of literacy and numeracy essential skills. However, there was a lack of strategic support for learning and skills from the NIPS headquarters, a consequence of which was significant and ongoing understaffing, an over-reliance on part-time staff, an inappropriate curriculum offer and the associated under utilisation of the excellent new facilities.
- 3.28 We were told by managers that ongoing staffing issues, along with the narrow curriculum offer, underlined the need for the prison to establish productive, collaborative partnerships with outside providers such as the further education and work-based learning sectors.
- 3.29 The arrangements for the quality assurance of the learning and skills provision were well established, and there was a detailed self-evaluation report and improvement plan. While the self-evaluation process was appropriately informed by direct classroom observations undertaken by senior managers, it could have been enhanced through a more effective analysis and use of the available data. More evaluative language in the self-evaluation report could also have been used.

Recommendations

- 3.30 **There should be better and more timely strategic support for learning and skills from the NIPS headquarters to address the under-staffing issues and to increase the utilisation of the new learning and skills centre.**
- 3.31 **Productive, collaborative partnerships should be established with outside providers such as the further education and work-based learning sectors, to broaden the curriculum on offer.**

Library

- 3.32 The library provision was generally good. It was welcoming, well maintained and provided a good range of contemporary and recreational reading stock. There was a good range of novels and non-fiction, complemented by a range of easy reads, oversized books, up to date legal reference volumes and foreign language texts, newspapers and magazines. Good attention was given to making the library inclusive.
- 3.33 The library, however, needed to be more proactively promoted across the prison to increase further the number of prisoners who used it regularly. There was insufficient access to digital resources, including access to the internet, and the prisoners would have benefited from access to a wider range of materials that supported learning and skills development. Access to the library had improved with increased opening hours, including evening and weekend access, and the prisoners who used it spoke about it favourably.

Recommendations

- 3.34 **There should be more proactive promotion of the library to increase the number of prisoners who use it.**
- 3.35 **Prisoners should have better access to digital resources, including access to the internet.**

Physical education and healthy living

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners understand the importance of healthy living, and are encouraged and enabled to participate in physical education in safe and decent surroundings.

- 3.36 Physical education (PE) provision was very good. It was promoted well and access was good. Participation rates were good and the reasons for non-attendance by inactive prisoners had been analysed effectively. Relevant accredited courses were delivered by well qualified PE staff and achievement rates were good. A wide range of well maintained fitness equipment was available. Accommodation was very good and indoor facilities were very well managed. The programme of continuing professional development for PE staff was very well conceived. There were very good working relationships between PE staff and prisoners.
- 3.37 Access to the range of sports facilities was good, with equitable arrangements for prisoners. Data had been collected on the usage of the facilities and regular analysis was carried out to identify the reasons for the non-attendance of particular groups of prisoners. Facility opening times included weekends and evenings. Programmes and fitness activities delivered in the main sports facility were appropriate to meet the needs of the prison population, with sufficient opportunities for the less active to access the range of facilities. Flexibility in the organisation of the activities on offer allowed changes to be made to meet the needs and interests of particular groups of prisoners, including foreign nationals and older inmates.
- 3.38 PE was promoted well throughout the prison. Relevant accredited courses that focused appropriately on improving the prisoners' understanding of personal fitness and healthy living were available. They were delivered by well qualified PE staff and achievement rates were good. The induction process was clear and prisoners were referred to the health care department for additional assessments when necessary.



- 3.39 Accommodation was very good. A very well managed sports hall was used for indoor sports such as soccer, badminton, basketball, circuit training, short mat bowls and a range of other activities. The main gym included a variety of cardiovascular machines, free weights equipment and resistance machines. Smaller gym areas were located across the residential accommodation and the range of mostly cardiovascular equipment varied from location to location. Outdoor 3-G synthetic pitches supplemented the indoor sports facilities. The showers were maintained well, and clean sports gear, fresh towels and shower gel were offered to all prisoners every time they used the main sports facility.
- 3.40 The PE provision was led very effectively. All staff had developed their knowledge and skills through a well conceived programme of continuing professional development. PE staff made effective use of the very good opportunities to develop their knowledge of the fitness industry; training had focused on the health promotion aspects of physical education through the achievement of the exercise referral qualification. PE staff had very good working relationships with prisoners and offered good support and advice on training programmes and the proper use of equipment. In addition, they promoted the learning opportunities available through the sports-related accredited courses.

CHAPTER 4:

Resettlement



Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

Planning for a prisoner's release or transfer starts on their arrival to the prison. Resettlement underpins the work of the whole prison, supported by strategic partnerships in the community and informed by assessment of prisoner risk and need. Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.

- 4.1 Strategic management of resettlement was more robust than when we last inspected the prison. The needs of the Maghaberry population had not yet been fully identified, but the process of a proper needs analysis had commenced. Offender management had a stronger profile across the prison, and integration with other departments was improving. Links with external resettlement agencies were good.
- 4.2 An up-to-date (February 2012) and comprehensive resettlement strategy was in place. It provided a clear legislative and operational context for the delivery of resettlement services, and took account of remand prisoners. While not entirely needs-based, the strategy applied actual local evidence, such as findings from a survey of the needs of 36 prisoners on extended custodial sentences, and work on a broader based needs analysis had commenced. The prison record and inmate system management (PRISM) database was generating useful data to assist management and to help target resettlement interventions.
- 4.3 The incorporation of resettlement services within the Offender Management Unit (OMU) represented major structural progress. The OMU comprised 17 NIPS discipline staff, supported by administrative staff, who were co-located with probation officers and voluntary community sector workers. There was good information sharing and collaborative working. The governor ensured that the NIPS OMU officers were well protected against redeployment.
- 4.4 The OMU approach to resettlement ranged from intensive engagement for those serving longer sentences to throughcare work (primarily accommodation, benefits, health care and addictions) with short-term and remand prisoners. There was no custody planning for remand prisoners, but they could attend education and participate in suitable programmes – which was an improvement since our last inspection.
- 4.5 Managerial oversight of resettlement was good, both within the OMU and at cross-departmental level. Oversight included file audits and dip sampling, and feedback was provided to staff. The uniformed NIPS staff benefited from a much broader range of relevant training than their residential counterparts. Most of the training was shared with other agencies and some was delivered in community settings.
- 4.6 There was currently no whole prison approach to resettlement as too many residential staff felt it was the exclusive domain of the OMU, and the lack of a personal officer scheme was a gap (see recommendation 2.29). There were, however, good links with most of the relevant external agencies.



Recommendation

4.7 The prison should complete a robust needs analysis of its population.

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.8 The offender management model had been carefully designed and implemented when new criminal justice legislation was introduced from 2008. Engagement with multi-agency public protection arrangements had improved in the past four years. The draft policy for managing prisoners serving life sentences needed to be finalised and implemented; lifers required a more suitable regime. A new 'step down' facility was urgently required to test lifers and other long-term prisoners prior to release.
- 4.9 Most eligible prisoners (90% of 438 in March 2012) had a sentence plan. A total of 95% of surveyed sentenced prisoners, who said that they had a plan felt involved in its preparation. Ultimately though, most reported that they did not believe they had been helped to desist from offending while in Maghaberry. The prisoner surveys showed Maghaberry was significantly better than local comparators in respect of eight 'preparation for release' or pathway areas.
- 4.10 Many prisoners were preoccupied with issues such as their pending case, appeal, health or family problems, which precluded meaningful engagement with sentence planning, and assistance was required for those who were less inclined to participate in any planning. Prisoner feedback verified the benefits of close engagement and residential officers had a role to play in motivating prisoners. Prisoners who were motivated could make significant progress but were often frustrated with the slow pace.
- 4.11 Prisoners within the scope of the OMU had well ordered case files with detailed entries. The files provided evidence of good inter-agency communication. Most sentenced prisoners whom we interviewed knew their case and sentence managers and understood their respective roles. They were aware of their risk of reoffending scores and, where appropriate, their risk of serious harm scores.
- 4.12 On average 20 prisoners were transferred to Magilligan Prison every week, mainly due to overcrowding at Maghaberry. These moves often took place shortly after sentencing and could interrupt resettlement progress.
- 4.13 While integration between offender management (OM) and residential staff to address resettlement issues was still not sufficient, there had been tangible progress: the health care department was now accepting referrals from the OMU and there was a monthly meeting with the prison's psychiatrist. The security department was also better engaged with resettlement issues than it had been previously.
- 4.14 Some 35% of determinate custodial sentenced (DCS) prisoners, who had been released so far, had returned on recall. This had a major impact on the workload of OMU personnel as these prisoners had to have their cases prepared for consideration by the Parole Commissioners, often within short timeframes.

- 
- 4.15 Prisoners could invite a family member to attend their sentence planning meetings but few did. Applications for home leave had doubled since our last inspection, and more than when we last inspected were being granted (84% compared with 71%).
- 4.16 At the last inspection we recommended an extension of resettlement provision for separated prisoners. This was not possible for Republican prisoners due to an ongoing protest, but some separated Loyalists had participated in a programme provided by the University of Ulster.

Public protection

- 4.17 Public protection arrangements had been strengthened, at both strategic and operational levels. Probation officers still took the lead on risk assessments and provided designated risk managers in keeping with the NIPS/Probation Board for Northern Ireland (PBNI) Service Level Agreement.
- 4.18 A useful biannual forum with the core Public Protection Arrangements Northern Ireland (PPANI) team had further improved NIPS engagement with the process. There was better engagement of NIPS staff in public protection training – 28 prison staff had undertaken PPANI training in January 2012.
- 4.19 The prison's security department was now making a tangible contribution to the prison's public protection work. This included circulating sexual offences prevention orders (SOPO) conditions, undertaking authorised phone intercepts, screening child visitors and attending licensing panels, risk management meetings and home leave boards.
- 4.20 There were gaps, such as difficulties in identifying hate crime and domestic violence motivation. Many remanded public protection prisoners received short sentences, which meant that they were released at court. As a result opportunities to address the risks associated with these prisoners were limited. However these gaps had been recognised by risk managers at the prison and its public protection partners and they were proactive in their efforts to manage risks effectively.
- 4.21 A biannual NIPS/PPANI forum had been established, which demonstrated greater engagement at a strategic level. There was also a high risk review group, which met quarterly.
- 4.22 The opportunity for victims' views to be represented was available when prisoners were applying for home leave and when licence conditions were being prepared for their release.

Categorisation

- 4.23 The security group was responsible for categorisation. Newly convicted prisoners were categorised within 72 hours of arriving at the prison using an algorithm that determined whether they were category A or B. Any prisoner not matching any of the criteria was determined to be category C. While all prisoners had the right to appeal, they were not formally informed of their categorisation in the first place.
- 4.24 Reviews were held yearly thereafter, and prisoners were invited to make written submissions alongside input from representatives from a range of other disciplines who had had meaningful contact with the prisoner over the previous 12 months. These could include representatives from OM, education, the chaplaincy, and others.



Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.25 Maghaberry oversaw the case management of all 206 prisoners serving indeterminate sentences in Northern Ireland. At the time of the inspection 177 of them were held at the prison. Nearly all had enhanced regime status, and the majority were held in Braid or Wilson Houses.
- 4.26 Progression and regression arrangements for lifers within the NIPS estate had improved since the 2009 inspection. There had been some positive developments for a small number of lifers: they could work outside the grounds and take greater responsibility within the prison and some had transferred to Magilligan Prison.
- 4.27 However the regime for many was still too limited. There was insufficient purposeful activity, especially in the early and mid-years of the prisoner's sentence. Braid House provided much better physical conditions than the main prison, but their access to education was limited and there was no free flow movement. The lifers in Braid House were critical about most issues except visits. They said that facilities such as the computer suite and video link were seldom, if ever, available for them to use. Several lifers who had been enrolled on Open University courses felt that they were being collectively punished when internet access was withdrawn following a transgression by one prisoner (see paragraph 3.16).
- 4.28 In April 2011, the NIPS decided temporarily to suspend its Prisoner Assessment Unit (PAU) in Belfast, which was an annexe of Maghaberry and operated as a 'step down' facility after allegations of misconduct. All staff and prisoners were returned to the main prison. Very few of the 21 prisoners were alleged to have been involved in the misconduct and were aggrieved because they felt that the NIPS was subjecting them to collective punishment. The suspension of the PAU was a major setback for lifers' release preparations.
- 4.29 A lifer policy had been drafted in February 2012, but it required further development before it could become a viable document. Standards for work with lifers were also required, and there was still no strategy for potential lifers. Our previous recommendation regarding piloting a personal officer scheme with lifers had not been implemented. Nor had a recommendation to provide lifer training for discipline staff, although a Braid House senior officer had begun to train colleagues on his own initiative.
- 4.30 While all lifers had a sentence plan, the planning process needed improvement. Most with whom we spoke were cynical about the value of their plans and annual reviews. They said they were bland and repetitive and that their situation only really improved at the three year pre-tariff stage, when they had their first hearing with the Parole Commissioners.
- 4.31 There were no dedicated lifer family days. It was positive that Braid House now had a prisoner forum but the minutes we saw reflected inconsistent attendance and often a lack of clear outcomes.
- 4.32 The lifer management unit had been integrated with the OMU in February 2012. This was a prudent step, which could be expected to yield benefits for lifer management in the medium to long-term.

Recommendations

- 4.33 **Prison management should further develop its regime for life prisoners to ensure progression to Braid House is not offset by the loss of other privileges.**



4.34 **Annual lifer reviews should become more meaningful and tailored to the individual and should be actively reviewed at least twice a year by the prisoner and a key worker.**

Housekeeping points

4.35 *There should be regular family days each year for lifers and their family members.*

4.36 *Facilities such as the Braid House video link and computer rooms should be more actively used.*

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners' resettlement needs are met prior to release. An effective multi-agency response is used to meet the specific needs of each individual prisoner in order to maximise the likelihood of successful reintegration into the community.

4.37 There was no custody planning for unconvicted men but those serving three months or more had a sentence plan. All prisoners had their accommodation and finance needs assessed on arrival, and services to help with benefit and debt problems were available. All sentenced prisoners were offered a pre-release interview within the last three months of custody to address any unmet needs. A Northern Ireland Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NIACRO) course provided prisoners with opportunities to develop a range of job search and employability skills. Systems were in place to assist most prisoners to access health services following release. A consultation was underway regarding a drug strategy and action plan, but no needs analysis had been carried out. There was good support to help prisoners maintain family relationships but insufficient family support officers to supervise child visits. Not all prisoners could have a weekly visit. Additional staff were required to deliver a core sex offenders treatment programme.

4.38 All prisoners had their accommodation, benefit and debt needs assessed on arrival and were referred as necessary to the housing rights and/or NIACRO debt workers. In 2011 a total of 2,220 prisoners had been interviewed, 96% of the 2,302 who had arrived.

4.39 There was no custody planning for unconvicted men, but those serving more than three months had a sentence plan and were allocated to a sentence manager in the OMU.

4.40 All sentenced prisoners were offered a pre-release interview within the last three months of custody to address any unmet needs. Clothing stored in reception could be laundered before release.

Accommodation

4.41 In our survey, 27% of prisoners said that they had arrived with housing problems and 1,353 men were identified as having housing needs in 2011, 60% of the total number of prisoners interviewed. In our survey, of the prisoners who said they needed help with accommodation 35%, fewer than in comparator prisons, said that they knew who to contact for help in the prison. Approximately 9% of sentenced men had been released without an address in 2011.



- 4.42 Those identified as having accommodation needs attended a housing advice talk delivered by a housing peer worker and an experienced full-time housing rights worker. The housing peer worker explained what help could be provided and assisted prisoners with basic matters, such as completing forms to safeguard housing benefit. The five housing peer workers had received suitable training for their role.
- 4.43 More complicated matters were referred to the housing rights worker who worked in the prison four days a week. She liaised with the Northern Ireland Housing Executive (the local authority housing provider in Northern Ireland) and with private landlords and provided advocacy and support on all housing matters. The worker maintained a range of statistics about action taken on behalf of prisoners, including referral source, type of intervention and known outcomes. She was based in the OMU and worked alongside OMU staff, including the NIACRO debt advisor.

Housekeeping point

- 4.44 *All prisoners should be aware of how to access help with accommodation problems.*

Education, training and employment

- 4.45 The links between the learning and skills department and the OMU were effective. The initial assessment of prisoners' educational and training needs and the education provision undertaken by them to meet these needs including, where appropriate, accreditation and achievement, were integrated well into individual sentence plans.
- 4.46 NIACRO provided an appropriate accredited course to give all prisoners, including those on remand, good opportunities to develop a range of job search and employability skills. There was inadequate access to ICT resources, particularly the internet, to complement and improve this provision (see recommendation 3.25). Connections with employers to help prepare a small number of prisoners for progression into appropriate employment on their release were improving. For those prisoners who had started their education before being transferred to another prison, an accurate record of their learning needs and achievements was sent to the receiving prison.

Health care

- 4.47 A GP letter was put together for prisoners who had been at the establishment for more than one month; they were also seen by a nurse in their house unit two to three days before discharge. A discharge coordinator liaised with health services in the community on behalf of those with complex mental health needs; however, she was not linked to resettlement services within the establishment.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.48 A draft consultation drug and alcohol strategy was under discussion, but annual prison-wide substance misuse needs analyses were not conducted. A draft three-year strategic action plan was also still in the consultation phase.
- 4.49 Our inspection of the inadequate drug and alcohol services and the overwhelming evidence of readily available illicit drugs and diverted medication demonstrated that the prison's drug strategy was neither properly resourced nor supported by key stakeholders. The monthly drug strategy committee meeting was very poorly attended, with clinical treatment and health care provider representation being almost non-existent. Furthermore, the governor in charge of the strategic approach had a management responsibility portfolio of nine major departments in the prison.

- 
- 4.50 Psychosocial services were provided by *Ad:ept*, including one-to-one work and delivery of the accredited prisoners addressing substance-related offending (*P-ASRO*) group programme and work with prisoners with alcohol problems.
- 4.51 Some prisoners spoke very highly of the care they received from their *Ad:ept* workers. Our inspection of case files also showed that effective psychosocial care was being delivered. However, while the quality was high, the quantity was disappointing. Waiting lists for psychosocial treatment were unacceptably long. *Ad:ept* staff told us that the average wait was two months, but that it could be up to six months. Some prisoners thought it could be as long as eight months. Restrictions in *Ad:ept* workers' access to prisoners during the core day contributed to limits on the realistic *Ad:ept* caseload numbers, which stood at approximately 90 between six workers – which represented less than 10% of the population.
- 4.52 Links with community agencies were reasonably good, although waiting lists could be up to six months after release, making effective resettlement and throughcare extremely difficult.

Recommendations

- 4.53 **The prison should implement the new drug strategy as soon as possible with an emphasis on the importance of key stakeholders' attendance at the monthly drug strategy meetings and engagement with the effective delivery of the strategy.**
- 4.54 **The prison should address the issue of waiting lists for psychosocial services as a matter of urgency. The prison should ensure that *Ad:ept* workers are not restricted in their access to clients during the working day.**

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.55 Of the 1,622 men identified as needing financial help in their initial needs assessment, 1,483 needed benefits advice and 139 debt advice – 66% and 6% of the total interviewed respectively. Notifications to cease payments were sent to the benefits agency, and benefits agency appointments were made for prisoners before release.
- 4.56 In our survey, 33% of prisoners said that they had money problems before they arrived in the prison, which was significantly higher than in the comparator prisons; of those who said they needed financial help fewer than in the comparator prisons said they knew where to find help in the prison.
- 4.57 An experienced NIACRO debt advisor was available one day a week. He received around 15 to 20 referrals every week, managed to see approximately 10 prisoners and often had a backlog of referrals. Prisoners with mortgage and rent arrears problems were given priority, but the worker responded to the full range of debt-related problems. No cover was provided during his absence.
- 4.58 With the permission of prisoners, the NIACRO worker also provided benefit and debt advice to family members. He was based in the OMU and worked alongside OMU staff including the housing rights worker.
- 4.59 The opportunity for prisoners to open bank accounts had recently ceased and efforts were being made to find an alternative banking provider. The benefits of a money management course recently piloted in all three Northern Ireland prisons were being evaluated during the inspection.



Recommendation

- 4.60 **The prison should ensure that the current level of service meets prisoner need and take action to rectify this if necessary.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.61 *All prisoners should be aware of how to access help with finance, benefit and debt problems.*

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.62 In our survey, 52% of those in the main prison said that they had received help to maintain contact with their family, significantly more than the 35% in comparator prisons; Roman Catholics were less positive than Protestants. Only 33% of prisoners in the Mourne House complex felt this was the case.
- 4.63 There were no incoming calls to prisoners from children or arrangements to deal with them. Two family support officers (FSO) helped prisoners and families maintain contact, and FSOs signposted visitors to support services in the community when necessary. Prisoners received information about FSO services during induction.
- 4.64 Children's visits, open to all except those remanded for less than three months, ran every week for up to eight prisoners. Children spent time with their father and the child's carer spent time with other carers and an FSO. Each prisoner could attend one visit each month, but numbers were such that prisoners waited around seven to eight months to join the scheme. The number of FSOs had been reduced from three to two, and seven of the last 25 children's days (28%) had been cancelled due to lack of an FSO, the last one at only 24-hours notice.
- 4.65 A Barnados worker ran parenting courses for prisoners, and FSOs could refer prisoners and their families to Relate for relationship counselling.
- 4.66 Visits were available mornings and afternoons for one hour, but not in the evenings. Convicted prisoners on the basic level of privileges could have only two visits every month, prisoners on the standard level were allowed three a month and those on the enhanced level, could have five a month. Visits for unconvicted men were capped at two visits a week.
- 4.67 The bright and welcoming visitors centre was well managed, and visitors were well supported by the Quaker service. Quaker volunteers provided prison visitors.
- 4.68 Meetings between the centre manager, prison managers and visits staff occurred irregularly. Visitor complaints, some dating back to early 2011 according to documents we saw, had not been answered. Minutes of the last meeting recorded that a senior officer had been asked to audit these for the next meeting.
- 4.69 All visitors were required to bring photographic identification, and there was no alternative if they did not have this. A bus took visitors from the visits centre to the search area then onto the prison, and back to the visits centre.
- 4.70 A positive indication by a drug dog resulted in the visitor being offered a closed visit or leaving. No further security intelligence was required. As in 2009, some prisoners and visitors complained that, while



visitors arrived in the visits room on time, prisoners were sometimes delayed. Records of prisoner movements showed that some prisoners did not leave their wing until after the start time of their visit.

- 4.71 There were two visits rooms in the main prison. Both had fixed seating, but the design of one of them allowed prisoners to sit next to their partner, mother or child (but not a male visitor). Furniture in the other room did not allow easy contact between prisoners and visitors and, as reported in the last two reports, was cramped and noisy. Children could play in a supervised play area to which both rooms had access. Prisoners could not access a toilet.
- 4.72 A suitable visits room was provided for prisoners and visitors in the Mourne House complex, but vulnerable prisoners in Glen House had visits in the Segregation Unit, which had very limited facilities.

Recommendations

- 4.73 **Prisoners should be able to receive incoming calls from children or have access to arrangements to deal with them.**
- 4.74 **All convicted prisoners should be able to receive at least one visit a week and the number of visits for unconvicted men should not be capped.**
- 4.75 **Closed visits should only be authorised when there is a significant risk justified by security intelligence.**
- 4.76 **The waiting time for children's visits should be reduced, and there should be sufficient supervisory staff to prevent cancellation.**

Housekeeping points

- 4.77 *Alternative acceptable forms of identification should be introduced for visitors to replace the need for photographic identification.*
- 4.78 *Prisoners should have access to toilets during visits.*
- 4.79 *Suitable visiting facilities should be provided for prisoners in Glen House.*

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.80 In our survey 36% of prisoners said that they were currently involved in an offending behaviour course, significantly more than in the comparator prisons (7%). Of those who had been involved 39%, fewer than in comparator prisons, and 63% of prisoners on the Mourne House complex, thought it would help them on release.
- 4.81 Programmes were delivered by a suitably trained team of psychology, probation staff and officers in a reasonable environment.
- 4.82 The accredited programmes available were appropriate for the population. They included four annual courses of the enhanced thinking skills (ETS) programme, and a cognitive self change (CSC) programme ran continuously.



- 4.83 An alcohol related violence course was due to start in April 2012 and a *P-ASRO* programme was already operating (see section on drugs and alcohol).
- 4.84 A total of 10 prisoners were assessed as suitable for a core sex offender treatment programme (SOTP), and a further 15 were awaiting assessment, including some at Magilligan Prison. We have been told that this is planned for the future.
- 4.85 The need for an intervention to address domestic violence had been recognised and there were plans to introduce a relevant programme later in 2012.
- 4.86 Prisoners were prioritised appropriately for programmes according to sentence progression and release dates. There was a published policy for the management of referrals to programmes and meetings to discuss candidates were minuted. Those with literacy needs were referred to education, and psychology staff undertook one-to-one work with men as necessary.
- 4.87 A variety of non-accredited interventions continued to run including: a motivational enhancement group (MEG), gaining opportunities and living skills (GOALS), Barnardo's parenting courses, and the Duke of Edinburgh award scheme.

Recommendation

- 4.88 **Prisoners assessed as needing to attend SOTP should be provided with the opportunity to do so.**

Additional resettlement services

- 4.89 There was no formal identification of prisoners with experience of abuse, rape or domestic violence. Referrals could be made to a counselling service offering support to men who had experienced trauma, but we were told that this was an expensive service and was rarely, if ever used.

Recommendation

- 4.90 **There should be appropriate and accessible services to support prisoners with experience of trauma.**

CHAPTER 5:

Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice



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

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1 An effective strategy to reduce levels of violence and address bullying should be developed. (HP95)
- 5.2 Medication administration procedures should be changed to ensure the prevention of medication diversion. (HP96)
- 5.3 An adequately staffed and fully integrated multi-disciplinary Addictions Team should be established to deliver timely and effective clinical and psychosocial drug and alcohol services based on a full assessment of the population's needs and aspirations for recovery. (HP97)
- 5.4 A wider range and quantity of meaningful work opportunities should be developed and these should include accreditation and progression opportunities where possible. (HP98)
- 5.5 The prison should monitor all protected characteristics and understand and investigate all identified inequalities, particularly those relating to Roman Catholic prisoners and in areas where staff discretion can be applied. It should ensure that robust action is taken to address these in order to deliver equality of outcomes for all prisoners. (HP99)

Main recommendations

To NIPS

- 5.6 The NIPS should develop a new pre-release scheme for lifers as a matter of urgency. The scheme should be based at a new 'step down' facility. (HP100)

Recommendations

To the governor

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.7 Written escort records of new prisoners should be put into place. (1.7)
- 5.8 Prisoners should only be handcuffed in vehicles in exceptional circumstances to meet security concerns. (1.8)

Early days in custody

- 5.9 The length of time prisoners spend in reception should be significantly reduced and initial health interviews shortened. (1.25)



5.10 All searching of prisoners when entering or leaving the prison should be carried out sensitively and respectfully. (1.26)

5.11 Tracking and other relevant processes should ensure all prisoners receive the information they need from a thorough induction programme. (1.27)

Bullying and violence reduction

5.12 Visible staff supervision should be improved in association rooms and other areas where prisoners feel unsafe. (1.43)

5.13 Accurate data on indicators of violence should be monitored and analysed routinely to inform the strategy. (1.44)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

5.14 Managers should conduct rigorous audits of action plans following investigations on deaths and near fatal incidents to be assured that required actions are in place. (1.60)

5.15 SPAR procedures should be improved with a particular focus on case management and reviews. (1.61)

5.16 The strategic safer custody meeting should monitor the use of observation cells and strip clothing to ensure their use is always necessary and proportionate. (1.62)

5.17 The Listener Scheme should be extended to the Mourne House complex. (1.63)

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

5.18 Arrangements for safeguarding vulnerable prisoners should be strengthened and reflect regional guidance. (1.69)

Security

5.19 Security arrangements for prisoners on separated units, including searching, should be based on regularly reviewed individual risk assessments. (1.84)

5.20 Intelligence analysts within the security function should be provided with appropriate training. (1.85)

5.21 MDT facilities should be moved to a more suitable location to ensure that the environment is respectful and suitable for forensic testing. (1.86)

Progressive regimes and earned privileges

5.22 The PREPS should be refocused so that it provides incentives and rewards for good behaviour rather than being overly focused on the punitive consequences of poor behaviour. Prisoners should receive equal pay when in the same jobs regardless of their privilege level. (1.94)

The use of force

5.23 All uniform staff should be trained in full control and restraint techniques. (1.113)



5.24 All records, including video recordings, relating to use of force for reasons of non-compliance should be routinely reviewed by a senior manager to ensure force is necessary and lawful. (1.114)

Segregation

5.25 Cellular confinement should only be used for the most serious offences, and punishments that impede or prevent contact with the outside world should not be used. (1.115)

5.26 Prisoners should only be located in special accommodation on the written authority of a senior manager, and should be relocated to mainstream accommodation as soon as the initial reasons for its use are no longer applicable. (1.116)

5.27 An effective multi-disciplinary care and reintegration planning process should be implemented to help prevent the psychological deterioration of prisoners subject to long periods in the Segregation Unit. (1.117)

5.28 Senior managers should routinely monitor and analyse a range of data across all three discipline areas – adjudications, use of force and segregation – in order to direct and improve strategic management of these areas. (1.118)

Substance misuse

5.29 Alcohol detoxification procedures should be reviewed to ensure that prisoners have adequate clinical support and access to necessary medication. (1.133)

5.30 A prison-wide blood-borne virus clinic should be established, offering appropriate tests, immunisation and treatment options to all prisoners (1.134)

Residential units

5.31 Cells designed for one prisoner should not be shared and unconvicted prisoners should not be required to share cells with convicted prisoners. (2.14)

5.32 Suitable storage areas should be provided for mops and buckets and staff and prisoners responsible for cleaning should be appropriately trained. (2.15)

5.33 Telephones should have a privacy hood or booth and noise from televisions in recreation rooms where telephones are located, should not be excessive. (2.16)

5.34 Managers should satisfy themselves that cell bells are receiving a response within five minutes during the day and at night. (2.17)

5.35 Staff responsible for CSRAs should be trained in their use. CSRAs should be reviewed routinely following significant incidents. (2.18)

5.36 Prisoners' formal requests should receive a response within seven working days as outlined in the prison's policy. (2.19)

Staff-prisoner relationships

5.37 A personal officer scheme should be implemented in all residential units and wing staff should contribute to sentence planning. (2.29)



5.38 Significant information relating to prisoners should be recorded in wing files, prison computer files and in the wing journal. (2.30)

Equality and diversity

5.39 There should be an equality and diversity policy specific to Maghaberry Prison that meets the requirements of anti-discrimination legislation and outlines how the needs of all minority groups will be met. (2.38)

5.40 The standard of equality impact assessments should be improved. (2.39)

5.41 Support groups and forums should be available for all minority groups and should be accessible to all prisoners from those minorities. (2.40)

5.42 Records of contact between staff and foreign national prisoners should be maintained and interpretation services should be used for all matters requiring confidentiality. (2.47)

5.43 To encourage foreign national prisoners to maintain family ties they should all have access to free telephone calls. (2.48)

5.44 UK Border Agency staff should attend the prison and engage with all foreign national prisoners more regularly. (2.49)

5.45 Older prisoners and those with disabilities should have individual assessments and where appropriate, individual care or support plans and PEEPs. Specific activities and provisions to support these prisoners should be improved. (2.50)

5.46 Support for gay and bisexual prisoners should be improved. (2.51)

Faith and religious activity

5.47 Provision for Muslim and Buddhist prisoners should be improved. (2.57)

Complaints

5.48 Complaint boxes should be relocated to areas unobserved by wing staff, and complaints should be emptied, recorded and tracked by an administrative member of staff. (2.68)

5.49 Senior managers should analyse robustly complaints by the number upheld, refused and withdrawn, by all protected characteristics and by the quality of the response. Any action taken should be recorded. (2.69)

5.50 Senior managers should investigate all serious complaints made against staff, quality check all other complaints about staff, and ensure that the reasons for the withdrawal of complaints are fully recorded. (2.70)

Legal rights

5.51 Information about legal services, particularly bail information, should be made available to prisoners. (2.77)

Health services

5.52 The health needs assessment should be completed as a matter of priority and used to drive improvements in joint working relationships and organisational objectives. (2.90)

- 
- 5.53 There should be effective management of patient safety issues such as the storage of substances hazardous to health. (2.91)
 - 5.54 Potentially dangerous ligature points in the health care department should be identified and where possible removed, or if this is not feasible, the risks effectively managed. (2.92)
 - 5.55 Defibrillators should, in all cases, be easily accessible to trained staff. (2.93)
 - 5.56 Effective arrangements should be in place for infection prevention and control and environmental cleanliness. (2.94)
 - 5.57 The current reception screening tool should be shortened and used to identify immediate health care needs. (2.104)
 - 5.58 Care of prisoners with lifelong conditions should be provided by nurses with the relevant skills and competency and in line with evidence-based best practice. (2.105)
 - 5.59 All waiting lists should be centrally managed and monitored. (2.106)
 - 5.60 Admission to the health care ward should be based on clinical need. (2.107)
 - 5.61 Prisoners requiring secondary care services should be able to access them without undue restrictions, delays and cancellations. (2.108)
 - 5.62 Prisoners should have access to barrier protection. (2.109)
 - 5.63 Medicines should be stored safely and securely at all times and administration and disposal records must be accurately maintained. (2.117)
 - 5.64 Prisoners should be able to see a dentist for non-urgent treatment within a reasonable timescale. (2.121)
 - 5.65 Prisoners requiring assessment by the Mental Health Team should be seen expeditiously. (2.128)
 - 5.66 Prisoners should be involved in the decisions about their care and treatment; access to an advocate should be provided. (2.129)
 - 5.67 Information relating to transfer director orders should be routinely collected and monitored to ensure that patients are transferred in a timely manner. (2.130)

Catering

- 5.68 Meal times should be reasonably spaced throughout the prison. (2.138)
- 5.69 Transport arrangements for food to the Mourne House complex should be improved. (2.139)

Time out of cell

- 5.70 The prison core day should be applied consistently across the prison and prisoners should be out of cell for the maximum amount of time allowed. (3.6)



5.71 All prisoners should have access to association in the evening. (3.7)

Learning and skills and work activities

5.72 There should be better support to help Open University students complete their courses. (3.21)

5.73 The quality of teaching, training and learning should be improved to ensure it more effectively engages all prisoners, in particular through the better use of technology to support and enhance their learning experiences. (3.22)

5.74 Action should be taken to reduce the range of ability levels in the essential skills lessons. (3.23)

5.75 The vocational curriculum should be broadened and balanced to include programmes that better match the local labour market trends and employment opportunities. (3.24)

5.76 The lack of ICT provision should be addressed as a matter of urgency. (3.25)

5.77 There should be more equitable access to education and vocational training programmes for those prisoners who do not have access to the learning and skills centre, in particular for prisoners serving life sentences. (3.26)

5.78 There should be better and more timely strategic support for learning and skills from the NIPS headquarters to address the under-staffing issues and to increase the utilisation of the new learning and skills centre. (3.30)

5.79 Productive, collaborative partnerships should be established with outside providers such as the further education and work-based learning sectors, to broaden the curriculum on offer. (3.31)

5.80 There should be more proactive promotion of the library to increase the number of prisoners who use it. (3.34)

5.81 Prisoners should have better access to digital resources, including access to the internet. (3.35)

Strategic management of resettlement

5.82 The prison should complete a robust needs analysis of its population. (4.7)

Offender management and planning

5.83 Prison management should further develop its regime for life prisoners to ensure progression to Braid House is not offset by the loss of other privileges. (4.33)

5.84 Annual lifer reviews should become more meaningful and tailored to the individual and should be actively reviewed at least twice a year by the prisoner and a key worker. (4.34)

Reintegration planning

5.85 The prison should implement the new drug strategy as soon as possible with an emphasis on the importance of key stakeholders' attendance at the monthly drug strategy meetings and engagement with the effective delivery of the strategy. (4.53)

- 
- 5.86 The prison should address the issue of waiting lists for psychosocial services as a matter of urgency. The prison should ensure that *Ad:ept* workers are not restricted in their access to clients during the working day. (4.54)
 - 5.87 The prison should ensure that the current level of service meets prisoner need and take action to rectify this if necessary. (4.60)
 - 5.88 Prisoners should be able to receive incoming calls from children or have access to arrangements to deal with them. (4.73)
 - 5.89 All convicted prisoners should be able to receive at least one visit a week and the number of visits for unconvicted men should not be capped. (4.74)
 - 5.90 Closed visits should only be authorised when there is a significant risk justified by security intelligence. (4.75)
 - 5.91 The waiting time for children's visits should be reduced, and there should be sufficient supervisory staff to prevent cancellation. (4.76)
 - 5.92 Prisoners assessed as needing to attend SOTP should be provided with the opportunity to do so. (4.88)
 - 5.93 There should be appropriate and accessible services to support prisoners with experience of trauma. (4.90)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

- 5.94 *Up-to-date information should be posted on notice boards in holding rooms. (1.28)*

Substance misuse

- 5.95 *Prisoners should be made fully aware of the requirements for pre-treatment urine tests. (1.135)*

Residential units

- 5.96 *Exercise areas should be less austere and include seating as a minimum. (2.20)*
- 5.97 *Lockable cabinets should be fitted in all cells. (2.21)*
- 5.98 *Missing shower curtains should be replaced and baths should be screened. (2.22)*
- 5.99 *Prisoners should be encouraged to eat out of their cells. (2.23)*

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.100 *Terms of reference should be established for prisoner forums and minutes of meetings should be put on display in residential areas. (2.31)*



Complaints

5.101 *The outcome of complaints should be recorded in all instances. (2.71)*

5.102 *Prisoners should be consulted about the complaints system. (2.72)*

Health services

5.103 *Prisoners who have been assessed as requiring aids to assist them on a daily basis should have easy access to them. (2.95)*

5.104 *All prisoners should have access to relevant immunisations and vaccinations. (2.110)*

5.105 *Patient information leaflets should be supplied for supervised medicines. (2.118)*

Purchases

5.106 *The dissatisfaction expressed by prisoners in the Mourne House complex should be investigated. (2.146)*

Offender management and planning

5.107 *There should be regular family days each year for lifers and their family members. (4.35)*

5.108 *Facilities such as the Braid House video link and computer rooms should be more actively used. (4.36)*

Reintegration planning

5.109 *All prisoners should be aware of how to access help with accommodation problems. (4.44)*

5.110 *All prisoners should be aware of how to access help with finance, benefit and debt problems. (4.61)*

5.111 *Alternative acceptable forms of identification should be introduced for visitors to replace the need for photographic identification. (4.77)*

5.112 *Prisoners should have access to toilets during visits. (4.78)*

5.113 *Suitable visiting facilities should be provided for prisoners in Glen House. (4.79)*

Section



Appendices



Appendix I: Inspection team - March 2012

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons

Nick Hardwick	Chief Inspector
Sean Sullivan	Team leader
Joss Crosbie	Inspector
Rosemarie Bugdale	Inspector
Paul Fenning	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Kellie Reeve	Inspector
Martin Owens	Inspector
<i>Specialist Inspectors</i>	
Elizabeth Tysoe	Health care Inspector
Paul Roberts	Substance misuse
<i>Research Team</i>	
Alice Reid	Research officer
Michael Skidmore	Research officer
Amy Summerfield	Research officer

Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland

Dr Michael Maguire	Chief Inspector
Tom McGonigle	Inspector

Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority

Elizabeth Colgan	Lead health care Inspector
Helen Daly	Pharmacy Inspector
Hall Graham	Dental and IR(ME)R Inspector
Winifred Maguire	Dental and IR(ME)R Inspector
Audrey Murphy	Mental health Inspector
Janet McCusker	Mental health Inspector
Shelagh O'Connor	Health care Inspector
Margaret Keating	Health care Inspector
Lyn Gawley	Health care Inspector

Education and Training Inspectorate

Barry O'Rourke	Reporting Inspector
John Baird	Deputy Reporting Inspector
Mark Barr	Inspector
Greer Henderson	Inspector
John McCusker	Inspector
Alistair Gilmour	Inspector

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Population breakdown by: (accurate for the first day of the Inspection)

(i) Status	Number of prisoners	%
Sentenced	540	54.33
Unsentenced	453	45.57
Detainees (Immigration warrant)	1	0.10
Total	994	100

Sentenced prisoners	Number of prisoners	%
Adult appellant	12	2.22
Adult determinate custodial sentence	128	23.7
Sentenced	161	29.81
Adult extended custodial sentence	41	7.59
Adult indeterminate sentence	7	1.3
Adult life sentence	158	29.26
Young offender life	2	0.37
Adult SOSP	8	1.48
Young offender SOSP	5	0.93
Fines	18	3.33
Total	540	100

(ii) Sentence	Number of prisoners	%
Less than 6 months	55	10.19
6 months to less than 12 months	48	8.89
12 months to less than 2 years	45	8.33
2 years to less than 4 years	67	12.41
4 years to less than 10 years	56	10.37
10 years and over (not life)	36	6.67
Life/indeterminate	170	31.48
Sentence not calculated	63	11.67
Total	540	100



(iii) Length of stay unsentenced	Number of prisoners	%
Less than 1 month	110	24.23
1 month to 3 months	112	24.67
3 months to 6 months	74	16.30
6 months to 1 year	100	22.03
1 year to 2 years	42	9.25
2 years to 4 years	15	3.30
4 years or more	1	0.22
Total	454	100

(iv) Main alleged offence	Number of prisoners	%
Other offences against the person	331	33.30
Sexual offence	96	9.66
Murder	171	17.20
Burglary/robbery/theft	192	19.32
Motoring offences	27	2.72
Fraud/forgery	7	0.70
Criminal damage	27	2.72
Drug offences	66	6.64
Offences against the state	24	2.41
Other offences	39	3.92
Not recorded	14	1.41
Total	994	100

(v) Age	Number of prisoners	%
18 years to 20 years	1	0.10
21 years to 29 years	402	40.44
30 years to 39 years	290	29.18
40 years to 49 years	210	21.13
50 years to 59 years	72	7.24
60 years to 69 years	15	1.51
70 plus years	4	0.40
Total	994	100

Youngest prisoner	20
Oldest prisoner	85
Average age	47



(vi) Home address	Number of prisoners	%
Northern Ireland (County Antrim)	427	42.96
Northern Ireland (County Armagh)	70	7.95
Northern Ireland (County Down)	124	12.47
Northern Ireland (County Fermanagh)	20	2.01
Northern Ireland (County Londonderry)	80	8.05
Northern Ireland (County Tyrone)	63	6.34
Republic of Ireland	22	2.21
England	18	1.81
Scotland	2	0.20
Hong Kong	1	0.10
Poland	1	0.10
The Netherlands	1	0.10
United States of America	1	0.10
No fixed abode	153	15.39
Address not known	2	0.20
Total	994	100

(vii) Nationality	Number of prisoners	%
British England	19	1.91
British Northern Ireland	694	69.82
British Scotland	7	0.7
Northern Irish	24	1.91
Foreign nationals	90	9.05
Irish	74	7.44
Total	994	100





(viii) Ethnicity	Number of prisoners	%
<i>White</i>	932	93.73
British		
Irish traveller	17	1.71
Irish		
Other white		
<i>Mixed ethnic group</i>	4	0.40
White and black Caribbean		
White and black African		
White and Asian		
Other mixed		
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>		
Indian	1	0.10
Pakistani	4	0.40
Bangladeshi	2	0.20
Other Asian		
<i>Black or black British</i>		
Caribbean	3	0.30
African	6	0.60
Other black	3	0.30
<i>Chinese or other ethnic group</i>		
Chinese	19	1.91
Other ethnic group	3	0.30
Total	994	100

(ix) Religion	Number of prisoners	%
Church of England	12	1.21
Church of Ireland	91	9.15
Church of Scotland	1	0.10
Christian Fellowship Church	1	0.10
Roman Catholic	504	50.70
Baptist	11	11.11
Methodist	28	2.82
Presbyterian	139	13.98
Pentecostal	6	0.60
Free Presbyterian	69	6.94
No subscribing Presbyterian	1	0.10
Christian	18	1.81
Muslim	13	1.31
Mormon	2	0.20
Hindu	1	0.10
Buddhist	5	0.50
Jewish	1	0.10
Pagan	1	0.10
Atheist	1	0.10
Elim	1	0.10
Orthodox	2	0.20
Other	10	1.01
No religion	76	7.65
Total	994	100

Breakdown of community background figures of Maghaberry staff

Grades	Protestant	Roman Catholic	Non-Determined	Male	Female
Prison Grades	654 (80.3%)	68 (8.3%)	92 (11.3%)	648 (79.6%)	166 (20.4%)
*General Service Grades	104 (76.5%)	27 (19.8%)	5 (3.7%)	46 (32.8%)	94 (67.1%)
TOTAL	758 (79.8%)	95 (10%)	97 (10.2%)	694 (72.7%)	260 (27.2%)

* There are four staff for which the prison does not hold community background information



Appendix III: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Choosing the sample size

The baseline for the sample size was calculated using a robust statistical formula provided by a Government department 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 15-16 February 2012, the overall prisoner population at Maghaberry Prison was 1,022.

The main prisoner population was 833. The sample size was 201 which represented 24% of the prisoner population.

The population in the separated units was 33 in Roe House, 10 in Bush House, and 146 in the Mourne House complex (108 in Braid and 38 in Wilson Houses). These units were sampled separately and a questionnaire was offered to every prisoner in these units.

Selecting the sample

For the main prisoner population respondents were randomly selected from a PRISM prisoner population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. This basically means every second person is selected from a PRISM 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.

In the separated units two prisoners in Braid and two in Wilson units (Mourne House complex) refused to complete the questionnaire. All but two prisoners in Roe House refused to complete the questionnaire. There were no refusals in the separated Bush unit.

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

Main prison

In total, 176 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 21% of the main prison population. The response rate was 88%. In addition to the four respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, 12 questionnaires were not returned and nine were returned blank.

Separated units

In Bush nine respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. The response rate was 90%. One survey was returned blank.

Mourne House

In Braid wing, 88 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. Two respondents refused to complete questionnaires, five were not returned, 11 were returned blank and two prisoners were not offered surveys as they were on temporary leave.

In Wilson wing, 31 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. Two respondents refused a questionnaire, two did not return their questionnaires, and three prisoners were not offered surveys as they were on temporary leave. No surveys were returned blank.

Comparisons

The following details the results from the survey. Data from each establishment has been weighted, in order to mimic a consistent percentage sampled in each establishment.

Some questions have been filtered according to the response to a previous question. Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation as to which respondents are included in the filtered questions. Otherwise, percentages provided refer to the entire sample. All missing responses are excluded from the analysis.

The following analyses have been conducted in the main prisoner units at Maghaberry:

- The current survey responses in 2012 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 36 local prisons since April 2006.
- The current survey responses in 2012 against the responses of prisoners surveyed at Maghaberry in 2009.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of Catholic and Protestant prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of foreign national prisoners and British nationals.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those that do not consider themselves to have a disability.



- The current survey responses in 2012 from Mourne House (Wilson and Braid) and all other main wings in Maghaberry.
- The current survey responses in 2012 from Mourne House (Wilson and Braid) against the responses of prisoners surveyed in Mourne House (Wilson and Martin) in 2009.
- A comparison within the 2012 Mourne House (Wilson and Braid) survey between the responses of Catholic and Protestant prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2012 Mourne House (Wilson and Braid) survey between the responses of foreign national prisoners and British nationals.
- A comparison within the 2012 Mourne House (Wilson and Braid) survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those that do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2012 Mourne House (Wilson and Braid) survey between the responses of prisoners aged over 50 and prisoners aged under 50.

In all the above documents, statistical significance is used to indicate 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. Orange shading has been used to show a significant difference in prisoners' background details.

It should be noted that, in order for statistical comparisons to be made between the most recent survey data and that of the previous survey, both sets of data have been coded in the same way. This may result in changes to percentages from previously published surveys. However, all percentages are true of the populations they were taken from, and the statistical significance is correct.

Summary

In addition, a summary of the survey results is attached. This shows a breakdown of responses for each question. Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.

No questions have been filtered within the summary so all percentages refer to responses from the entire sample. The percentages to certain responses within the summary, for example 'Not sentenced' options across questions, may differ slightly. This is due to different response rates across questions, meaning that the percentages have been calculated out of different totals (all missing data is excluded). The actual numbers will match up as the data is cleaned to be consistent.

Percentages shown in the summary may differ by 1 or 2% from that shown in the comparison data as the comparator data has been weighted for comparison purposes.



Survey results – main site

Section 1: About you

In order for us to ensure that everyone is treated equally within this prison, we ask that you fill in the following information about yourself. This will allow us to look at the answers provided by different groups of people in order to detect discrimination and to investigate whether there are equal opportunities for everyone across all areas of prison life. Your responses to these questions will remain both anonymous and confidential.

Q1.2 How old are you?

Under 21	0 (0%)
21 - 29	79 (45%)
30 - 39	46 (26%)
40 - 49	36 (21%)
50 - 59	11 (6%)
60 - 69.....	1 (1%)
70 and over.....	2 (1%)

Q1.3 Are you sentenced?

Yes.....	69 (40%)
Yes - on recall	6 (3%)
No - awaiting trial.....	59 (34%)
No - awaiting sentence.....	40 (23%)
No - awaiting deportation.....	0 (0%)

Q1.4 How long is your sentence?

Not sentenced.....	99 (59%)
Less than 6 months.....	15 (9%)
6 months to less than 1 year.....	8 (5%)
1 year to less than 2 years.....	8 (5%)
2 years to less than 4 years.....	9 (5%)
4 years to less than 10 years.....	14 (8%)
10 years or more.....	3 (2%)
ICS/ECS	2 (1%)
Life.....	11 (7%)

Q1.5 Do you hold UK citizenship?

Yes.....	149 (87%)
No	23 (13%)

Q1.6 Do you understand spoken English?

Yes.....	166 (99%)
No.....	2 (1%)

Q1.7 Do you understand written English?

Yes.....	163 (96%)
No.....	6 (4%)





Q1.8 What is your ethnic origin?

White - British.....	83 (49%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese.....	4 (2%)
White - Irish.....	71 (42%)	Asian or Asian British - other.....	0 (0%)
White - other.....	7 (4%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean.....	0 (0%)
Black or black British - Caribbean.....	0 (0%)	Mixed race - white and black African.....	1 (1%)
Black or black British - African.....	1 (1%)	Mixed race - white and Asian.....	0 (0%)
Black or black British - other.....	0 (0%)	Mixed race - other.....	0 (0%)
Asian or Asian British - Indian.....	0 (0%)	Arab.....	1 (1%)
Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	1 (1%)	Other ethnic group.....	0 (0%)
Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	0 (0%)		

Q1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?

Yes.....	2 (1%)
No.....	158 (99%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

None.....	7 (4%)	Buddhist.....	5 (3%)
Church of Ireland.....	11 (7%)	Hindu.....	0 (0%)
Catholic.....	82 (49%)	Jewish.....	0 (0%)
Protestant.....	51 (31%)	Muslim.....	3 (2%)
Presbyterian.....	3 (2%)	Sikh.....	0 (0%)
Methodist.....	0 (0%)	Other.....	1 (1%)
Other Christian denomination.....	4 (2%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

Heterosexual/straight.....	164 (98%)
Homosexual/gay.....	2 (1%)
Bisexual.....	2 (1%)

Q1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs)?

Yes.....	67 (39%)
No.....	104 (61%)

Q1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?

Yes.....	12 (7%)
No.....	150 (93%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes.....	48 (28%)
No.....	122 (72%)

Q1.15 Do you have children under the age of 18?

Yes.....	105 (61%)
No.....	66 (39%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1 On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?

Less than 2 hours.....	111 (66%)
2 hours or longer.....	47 (28%)
Don't remember.....	10 (6%)



- Q2.2 On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?**
My journey was less than two hours 111 (66%)
Yes 12 (7%)
No 41 (25%)
Don't remember 3 (2%)
- Q2.3 On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?**
My journey was less than two hours 111 (67%)
Yes 4 (2%)
No 48 (29%)
Don't remember 3 (2%)
- Q2.4 On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?**
Yes 83 (50%)
No 69 (42%)
Don't remember 14 (8%)
- Q2.5 On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?**
Yes 105 (63%)
No 55 (33%)
Don't remember 6 (4%)
- Q2.6 On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?**
Very well 32 (19%)
Well 62 (36%)
Neither 47 (27%)
Badly 10 (6%)
Very badly 14 (8%)
Don't remember 7 (4%)
- Q2.7 Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you).**
Yes, someone told me 112 (67%)
Yes, I received written information 7 (4%)
No, I was not told anything 36 (22%)
Don't remember 13 (8%)
- Q2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?**
Yes 119 (70%)
No 41 (24%)
Don't remember 11 (6%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

- Q3.1 How long were you in reception?**
Less than 2 hours 72 (43%)
2 hours or longer 91 (54%)
Don't remember 5 (3%)
- Q3.2 When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?**
Yes 102 (59%)
No 62 (36%)
Don't remember 8 (5%)





Q3.3 Overall, how were you treated in reception?

Very well.....	27 (16%)
Well	64 (37%)
Neither.....	41 (24%)
Badly.....	27 (16%)
Very badly.....	13 (8%)
Don't remember.....	1 (1%)

Q3.4 Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you).

Loss of property	21 (12%)	Physical health	38 (22%)
Housing problems.....	45 (27%)	Mental health.....	57 (34%)
Contacting employers.....	3 (2%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	23 (14%)
Contacting family.....	51 (30%)	Getting phone numbers.....	48 (28%)
Childcare	10 (6%)	Other	6 (4%)
Money worries.....	55 (33%)	Did not have any problems	29 (17%)
Feeling depressed or suicidal	52 (31%)		

Q3.5 Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?

Yes	51 (31%)
No	83 (51%)
Did not have any problems	29 (18%)

Q3.6 When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you).

Tobacco.....	65 (38%)
A shower.....	119 (69%)
A free telephone call.....	124 (72%)
Something to eat.....	105 (61%)
PIN phone credit.....	85 (49%)
Toiletries/basic items.....	102 (59%)
Did not receive anything	13 (8%)

Q3.7 When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you).

Chaplain	96 (57%)
Someone from health services	108 (64%)
A Listener/Samaritans	41 (24%)
Tuck shop/canteen	86 (51%)
Did not have access to any of these	23 (14%)

Q3.8 When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you).

What was going to happen to you.....	69 (42%)
What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal	65 (40%)
How to make routine requests (applications).....	63 (38%)
Your entitlement to visits	72 (44%)
Health services	75 (46%)
Chaplaincy.....	74 (45%)
Not offered any information	39 (24%)

Q3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?

Yes.....	109 (63%)
No	57 (33%)
Don't remember.....	7 (4%)



- Q3.10 How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?**
- Have not been on an induction course** 35 (20%)
 - Within the first week 76 (44%)
 - More than a week 51 (29%)
 - Don't remember 11 (6%)
- Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?**
- Have not been on an induction course** 35 (21%)
 - Yes 63 (38%)
 - No 54 (33%)
 - Don't remember 13 (8%)
- Q3.12 How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?**
- Did not receive an assessment** 63 (39%)
 - Within the first week 27 (17%)
 - More than a week 51 (31%)
 - Don't remember 21 (13%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

- Q4.1 How easy is it to:**
- | | Very easy | Easy | Neither | Difficult | Very difficult | N/A |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------------|----------|
| Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative? | 23 (14%) | 67 (41%) | 24 (15%) | 23 (14%) | 16 (10%) | 10 (6%) |
| Attend legal visits? | 26 (17%) | 79 (51%) | 18 (12%) | 17 (11%) | 5 (3%) | 10 (6%) |
| Get bail information? | 10 (7%) | 37 (26%) | 35 (24%) | 19 (13%) | 20 (14%) | 24 (17%) |
- Q4.2 Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?**
- Not had any letters** 45 (27%)
 - Yes 80 (48%)
 - No 41 (25%)
- Q4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?**
- Yes 35 (22%)
 - No 24 (15%)
 - Don't know 101 (63%)
- Q4.4 Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:**
- | | Yes | No | Don't know |
|--|-----------|----------|------------|
| Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week? | 143 (85%) | 24 (14%) | 1 (1%) |
| Are you normally able to have a shower every day? | 153 (92%) | 10 (6%) | 3 (2%) |
| Do you normally receive clean sheets every week? | 137 (83%) | 21 (13%) | 8 (5%) |
| Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week? | 130 (79%) | 28 (17%) | 7 (4%) |
| Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes? | 67 (41%) | 48 (30%) | 47 (29%) |
| Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time? | 102 (61%) | 64 (39%) | 0 (0%) |
| If you need to, can you normally get your stored property? | 42 (26%) | 66 (40%) | 55 (34%) |
- Q4.5 What is the food like here?**
- Very good 6 (4%)
 - Good 20 (12%)





Neither.....	40 (23%)
Bad.....	44 (26%)
Very bad.....	61 (36%)

Q4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?

Have not bought anything yet/don't know	8 (5%)
Yes.....	104 (60%)
No.....	60 (35%)

Q4.7 Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?

Yes.....	85 (50%)
No.....	19 (11%)
Don't know.....	66 (39%)

Q4.8 Are your religious beliefs respected?

Yes.....	95 (56%)
No.....	33 (19%)
Don't know/N/A.....	42 (25%)

Q4.9 Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?

Yes.....	110 (64%)
No.....	14 (8%)
Don't know/N/A.....	49 (28%)

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

I don't want to attend	38 (23%)
Very easy.....	31 (19%)
Easy.....	39 (24%)
Neither.....	9 (5%)
Difficult.....	12 (7%)
Very difficult.....	8 (5%)
Don't know.....	28 (17%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1 Is it easy to make an application?

Yes.....	91 (57%)
No.....	27 (17%)
Don't know.....	42 (26%)

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

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are applications dealt with fairly?	68 (43%)	42 (27%)	47 (30%)
Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	68 (47%)	45 (31%)	31 (22%)

Q5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?

Yes.....	93 (62%)
No.....	25 (17%)
Don't know.....	32 (21%)

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

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are complaints dealt with fairly?	73 (44%)	40 (24%)	54 (32%)
Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	73 (48%)	44 (29%)	35 (23%)

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

Yes.....	40 (28%)
No.....	105 (72%)

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

Don't know who they are	95 (59%)
Very easy.....	10 (6%)
Easy.....	9 (6%)
Neither.....	18 (11%)
Difficult.....	18 (11%)
Very difficult.....	12 (7%)

Section 6: Progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1 Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the progressive regimes and earned privileges (PREP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels).

Don't know what the PREP scheme is	35 (21%)
Yes.....	69 (42%)
No.....	39 (24%)
Don't know.....	21 (13%)

Q6.2 Do the different levels of the PREP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels).

Don't know what the PREP scheme is	35 (21%)
Yes.....	70 (43%)
No.....	44 (27%)
Don't know.....	15 (9%)

Q6.3 In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?

Yes.....	25 (15%)
No.....	141 (85%)

Q6.4 If you have spent a night in the segregation and separation unit (SSU) in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?

I have not been to the SSU in the last 6 months	122 (79%)
Very well.....	4 (3%)
Well.....	9 (6%)
Neither.....	7 (5%)
Badly.....	6 (4%)
Very badly.....	6 (4%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1 Do most staff treat you with respect?

Yes.....	135 (81%)
No.....	31 (19%)



Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes.....	109 (68%)
	No	51 (32%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes.....	56 (35%)
	No.....	104 (65%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	Do not go on association	30 (18%)
	Never	40 (24%)
	Rarely.....	26 (16%)
	Some of the time	33 (20%)
	Most of the time	17 (10%)
	All of the time	19 (12%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I have not met him/her	103 (63%)
	In the first week	29 (18%)
	More than a week	10 (6%)
	Don't remember	21 (13%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her	103 (68%)
	Very helpful	22 (15%)
	Helpful	14 (9%)
	Neither	6 (4%)
	Not very helpful	4 (3%)
	Not at all helpful	2 (1%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes.....	86 (52%)
	No	80 (48%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes.....	36 (22%)
	No.....	127 (78%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you).	
	Never felt unsafe	80 (50%)
	At meal times.....	11 (7%)
	Everywhere.....	16 (10%)
	At health services	16 (10%)
	SSU.....	8 (5%)
	Visits area	21 (13%)
	Association areas	31 (19%)
	In wing showers	15 (9%)
	Reception area	13 (8%)
	In gym showers.....	10 (6%)
	At the gym.....	11 (7%)
	In corridors/stairwells.....	12 (8%)
	In an exercise yard	28 (18%)

On your landing/wing.....	17 (11%)
At work.....	2 (1%)
In your cell.....	17 (11%)
During movement.....	28 (18%)
At religious services.....	6 (4%)
At education.....	6 (4%)

Q8.4 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?

Yes	66 (39%)
No.....	102 (61%)

Q8.5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you).

Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....	37 (22%)
Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)	12 (7%)
Sexual abuse	7 (4%)
Feeling threatened or intimidated	39 (23%)
Having your canteen/property taken	4 (2%)
Medication	13 (8%)
Debt.....	4 (2%)
Drugs.....	6 (4%)
Your race or ethnic origin.....	11 (7%)
Your religion/religious beliefs.....	14 (8%)
Your nationality	11 (7%)
You are from a different part of the country than others	12 (7%)
You are from a Traveller community	2 (1%)
Your sexual orientation	1 (1%)
Your age	1 (1%)
You have a disability.....	7 (4%)
You were new here	6 (4%)
Your offence/crime.....	21 (13%)
Gang related issues	12 (7%)

Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes	60 (36%)
No.....	107 (64%)

Q8.7 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you).

Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....	35 (21%)
Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)	14 (8%)
Sexual abuse	8 (5%)
Feeling threatened or intimidated	30 (18%)
Medication	14 (8%)
Debt.....	2 (1%)
Drugs.....	5 (3%)
Your race or ethnic origin.....	9 (5%)
Your religion/religious beliefs.....	14 (8%)
Your nationality	12 (7%)
You are from a different part of the country than others	6 (4%)
You are from a traveller community	1 (1%)
Your sexual orientation.....	1 (1%)
Your age	1 (1%)
You have a disability.....	5 (3%)
You were new here	4 (2%)
Your offence/crime.....	13 (8%)
Gang related issues	7 (4%)



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

Not been victimised	84 (56%)
Yes.....	31 (21%)
No.....	35 (23%)

Section 9: Health services

Q9.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?

	Don't know	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	13 (8%)	11 (7%)	43 (27%)	19 (12%)	57 (35%)	19 (12%)
The nurse	10 (7%)	30 (20%)	62 (41%)	17 (11%)	27 (18%)	6 (4%)
The dentist	28 (19%)	6 (4%)	17 (12%)	11 (8%)	35 (24%)	49 (34%)

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

	Not been	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	15 (9%)	20 (12%)	38 (24%)	25 (16%)	34 (21%)	29 (18%)
The nurse	10 (6%)	35 (22%)	53 (34%)	25 (16%)	15 (9%)	20 (13%)
The dentist	49 (34%)	14 (10%)	20 (14%)	21 (15%)	14 (10%)	25 (17%)

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

Not been	10 (6%)
<i>Very good</i>	20 (12%)
<i>Good</i>	45 (28%)
<i>Neither</i>	28 (17%)
<i>Bad</i>	23 (14%)
<i>Very bad</i>	36 (22%)

Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes.....	112 (67%)
No	55 (33%)

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

Not taking medication	55 (34%)
Yes, all my meds.....	81 (50%)
Yes, some of my meds.....	15 (9%)
No.....	10 (6%)

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

Yes.....	85 (51%)
No	81 (49%)

Q9.7 Are you being helped/supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff).

Do not have any emotional or mental health problems	81 (50%)
Yes.....	39 (24%)
No	41 (25%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1 Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?

Yes	48 (29%)
No	119 (71%)

Q10.2 Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?

Yes	54 (33%)
No	112 (67%)

Q10.3 Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?

Very easy	45 (28%)
Easy	16 (10%)
Neither	8 (5%)
Difficult	15 (9%)
Very difficult	8 (5%)
Don't know	71 (44%)

Q10.4 Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?

Very easy	5 (3%)
Easy	10 (6%)
Neither	3 (2%)
Difficult	15 (10%)
Very difficult	35 (23%)
Don't know	87 (56%)

Q10.5 Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?

Yes	15 (9%)
No	150 (91%)

Q10.6 Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?

Yes	17 (11%)
No	143 (89%)

Q10.7 Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?

<i>Did not/do not have a drug problem</i>	108 (68%)
Yes	23 (15%)
No	27 (17%)

Q10.8 Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?

<i>Did not/do not have an alcohol problem</i>	112 (68%)
Yes	24 (15%)
No	29 (18%)

Q10.9 Was the support or help you received while in this prison helpful?

<i>Did not have a problem/did not receive help</i>	119 (76%)
Yes	29 (19%)
No	8 (5%)



Section 11: Activities

Q11.1 How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?

	Don't know	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
Prison job	31 (20%)	7 (5%)	21 (14%)	20 (13%)	43 (28%)	32 (21%)
Vocational or skills training	36 (25%)	9 (6%)	32 (23%)	23 (16%)	25 (18%)	17 (12%)
Education (including basic skills)	33 (23%)	16 (11%)	52 (36%)	19 (13%)	12 (8%)	14 (10%)
Offending behaviour programmes	54 (38%)	4 (3%)	21 (15%)	23 (16%)	17 (12%)	23 (16%)

Q11.2 Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you).

Not involved in any of these	66 (43%)
Prison job.....	57 (37%)
Vocational or skills training.....	18 (12%)
Education (including basic skills).....	55 (35%)
Offending behaviour programmes.....	9 (6%)

Q11.3 If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?

	Not been involved	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Prison job	57 (41%)	37 (27%)	28 (20%)	16 (12%)
Vocational or skills training	57 (48%)	27 (23%)	16 (13%)	19 (16%)
Education (including basic skills)	55 (41%)	46 (35%)	14 (11%)	18 (14%)
Offending behaviour programmes	64 (56%)	20 (17%)	17 (15%)	14 (12%)

Q11.4 How often do you usually go to the library?

Don't want to go	44 (28%)
<i>Never</i>	61 (38%)
<i>Less than once a week</i>	20 (13%)
<i>About once a week</i>	25 (16%)
<i>More than once a week</i>	10 (6%)

Q11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?

Don't use it	88 (57%)
<i>Yes</i>	32 (21%)
<i>No</i>	34 (22%)

Q11.6 How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?

Don't want to go	47 (30%)
<i>0</i>	41 (26%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	11 (7%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	55 (35%)
<i>More than 5</i>	3 (2%)

Q11.7 How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?

Don't want to go	23 (14%)
<i>0</i>	28 (17%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	31 (19%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	38 (23%)
<i>More than 5</i>	43 (26%)

Q11.8 How many times do you usually have association each week?

Don't want to go	26 (17%)
<i>0</i>	20 (13%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	14 (9%)

3 to 5	25 (16%)
More than 5	72 (46%)

Q11.9 How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc).

Less than 2 hours.....	54 (33%)
2 to less than 4 hours.....	35 (22%)
4 to less than 6 hours.....	19 (12%)
6 to less than 8 hours.....	18 (11%)
8 to less than 10 hours.....	17 (10%)
10 hours or more	13 (8%)
Don't know	6 (4%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?

Yes.....	83 (52%)
No.....	77 (48%)

Q12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?

Yes.....	44 (28%)
No.....	116 (73%)

Q12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?

Yes.....	49 (31%)
No.....	111 (69%)

Q12.4 How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?

<i>I don't get visits</i>	20 (13%)
Very easy.....	11 (7%)
Easy.....	30 (19%)
Neither.....	21 (13%)
Difficult.....	39 (25%)
Very difficult.....	27 (17%)
Don't know.....	8 (5%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1 Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?

Not sentenced	99 (60%)
Yes.....	32 (20%)
No.....	33 (20%)

Q13.2 What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison?

Not sentenced/NA	132 (81%)
No contact.....	5 (3%)
Letter.....	0 (0%)
Phone.....	0 (0%)
Visit.....	25 (15%)



Q13.3 Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?

Yes 34 (23%)
No 114 (77%)

Q13.4 Do you have a sentence plan?

Not sentenced 99 (60%)
Yes 36 (22%)
No 30 (18%)

Q13.5 How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced..... 129 (80%)
Very involved 16 (10%)
Involved 5 (3%)
Neither 3 (2%)
Not very involved 8 (5%)
Not at all involved 1 (1%)

Q13.6 Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you).

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced..... 129 (82%)
Nobody 6 (4%)
Offender supervisor 6 (4%)
Offender manager 11 (7%)
Named/personal officer 7 (4%)
Staff from other departments 8 (5%)

Q13.7 Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced..... 129 (81%)
Yes 20 (13%)
No 3 (2%)
Don't know 7 (4%)

Q13.8 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced..... 129 (82%)
Yes 3 (2%)
No 18 (11%)
Don't know 7 (4%)

Q13.9 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced..... 129 (82%)
Yes 12 (8%)
No 9 (6%)
Don't know 8 (5%)

Q13.10 Do you have a needs based custody plan?

Yes 14 (9%)
No 77 (52%)
Don't know 57 (39%)

Q13.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?

Yes 20 (14%)
No 127 (86%)



**Q13.12 Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release?
(Please tick all that apply to you).**

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	25 (19%)	24 (18%)	83 (63%)
Accommodation	23 (17%)	40 (29%)	74 (54%)
Benefits	23 (17%)	33 (24%)	79 (59%)
Finances	22 (18%)	18 (14%)	85 (68%)
Education	26 (20%)	28 (22%)	75 (58%)
Drugs and alcohol	33 (25%)	31 (24%)	66 (51%)

Q13.13 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

Not sentenced	99 (63%)
Yes	28 (18%)
No	30 (19%)

Survey results - Mourne

Section 1: About you

Q1.2 How old are you?

<i>Under 21</i>	0 (0%)
<i>21 - 29</i>	33 (28%)
<i>30 - 39</i>	36 (30%)
<i>40 - 49</i>	27 (23%)
<i>50 - 59</i>	20 (17%)
<i>60 - 69</i>	3 (3%)
<i>70 and over</i>	0 (0%)

Q1.3 Are you sentenced?

Yes	105 (88%)
Yes - on recall	12 (10%)
No - awaiting trial	2 (2%)
No - awaiting sentence	0 (0%)
No - awaiting deportation	0 (0%)

Q1.4 How long is your sentence?

Not sentenced	2 (2%)
<i>Less than 6 months</i>	4 (3%)
<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	9 (8%)
<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	2 (2%)
<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	6 (5%)
<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	7 (6%)
<i>10 years or more</i>	8 (7%)
ICS/ECS	2 (2%)
Life	77 (66%)

Q1.5 Do you hold UK citizenship?

Yes	102 (86%)
No	16 (14%)





Q1.6 Do you understand spoken English?

Yes..... 116 (97%)
 No..... 3 (3%)

Q1.7 Do you understand written English?

Yes..... 117 (98%)
 No..... 2 (2%)

Q1.8 What is your ethnic origin?

White - British 74 (62%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese 2 (2%)
White - Irish..... 36 (30%)	Asian or Asian British - other..... 0 (0%)
White - other 4 (3%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean 0 (0%)
Black or black British - Caribbean 2 (2%)	Mixed race - white and black African 0 (0%)
Black or black British - African 0 (0%)	Mixed race - white and Asian..... 0 (0%)
Black or black British - other..... 0 (0%)	Mixed race - other..... 0 (0%)
Asian or Asian British - Indian 0 (0%)	Arab..... 0 (0%)
Asian or Asian British - Pakistani..... 0 (0%)	Other ethnic group 1 (1%)
Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi 0 (0%)	

Q1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?

Yes..... 3 (3%)
 No..... 105 (97%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

None 15 (13%)	Buddhist 1 (1%)
Church of Ireland..... 8 (7%)	Hindu 0 (0%)
Catholic..... 38 (32%)	Jewish 0 (0%)
Protestant 38 (32%)	Muslim 0 (0%)
Presbyterian 9 (8%)	Sikh..... 0 (0%)
Methodist..... 2 (2%)	Other 2 (2%)
Other Christian denomination 5 (4%)	

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

Heterosexual/straight..... 117 (99%)
 Homosexual/gay 0 (0%)
 Bisexual..... 1 (1%)

Q1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs)?

Yes 29 (24%)
 No 90 (76%)

Q1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?

Yes..... 7 (6%)
 No..... 111 (94%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes 50 (42%)
 No 69 (58%)

Q1.15 Do you have children under the age of 18?

Yes 59 (51%)
 No..... 56 (49%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

- Q2.1 On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?**
- | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|
| <i>Less than 2 hours</i> | 57 (49%) |
| <i>2 hours or longer</i> | 28 (24%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 32 (27%) |
- Q2.2 On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| <i>My journey was less than two hours</i> | 57 (49%) |
| <i>Yes</i> | 3 (3%) |
| <i>No</i> | 44 (38%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 12 (10%) |
- Q2.3 On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| <i>My journey was less than two hours</i> | 57 (50%) |
| <i>Yes</i> | 3 (3%) |
| <i>No</i> | 45 (39%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 10 (9%) |
- Q2.4 On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?**
- | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| <i>Yes</i> | 48 (41%) |
| <i>No</i> | 56 (48%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 13 (11%) |
- Q2.5 On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?**
- | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| <i>Yes</i> | 77 (66%) |
| <i>No</i> | 29 (25%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 11 (9%) |
- Q2.6 On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?**
- | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| <i>Very well</i> | 16 (14%) |
| <i>Well</i> | 39 (33%) |
| <i>Neither</i> | 41 (35%) |
| <i>Badly</i> | 7 (6%) |
| <i>Very badly</i> | 3 (3%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 11 (9%) |
- Q2.7 Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you).**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| <i>Yes, someone told me</i> | 67 (58%) |
| <i>Yes, I received written information</i> | 4 (3%) |
| <i>No, I was not told anything</i> | 35 (30%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 11 (9%) |
- Q2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?**
- | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| <i>Yes</i> | 59 (52%) |
| <i>No</i> | 49 (43%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 5 (4%) |



Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	37 (32%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	59 (51%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	20 (17%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	<i>Yes</i>	60 (52%)
	<i>No</i>	47 (41%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (8%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	<i>Very well</i>	13 (11%)
	<i>Well</i>	30 (26%)
	<i>Neither</i>	44 (38%)
	<i>Badly</i>	20 (17%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	6 (5%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (2%)
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you).	
	<i>Loss of property</i>	27 (25%)
	<i>Physical health</i>	16 (15%)
	<i>Housing problems</i>	12 (11%)
	<i>Mental health</i>	21 (19%)
	<i>Contacting employers</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i>	9 (8%)
	<i>Contacting family</i>	32 (29%)
	<i>Getting phone numbers</i>	26 (24%)
	<i>Childcare</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>Other</i>	7 (6%)
	<i>Money worries</i>	27 (25%)
	<i>Did not have any problems</i>	33 (30%)
	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	22 (20%)
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	21 (19%)
	<i>No</i>	56 (51%)
	<i>Did not have any problems</i>	33 (30%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you).	
	<i>Tobacco</i>	38 (33%)
	<i>A shower</i>	75 (65%)
	<i>A free telephone call</i>	51 (44%)
	<i>Something to eat</i>	58 (50%)
	<i>PIN phone credit</i>	43 (37%)
	<i>Toiletries/basic items</i>	55 (47%)
	<i>Did not receive anything</i>	21 (18%)
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you).	
	<i>Chaplain</i>	49 (43%)
	<i>Someone from health services</i>	66 (58%)

A Listener/Samaritans	14 (12%)
Tuck shop/canteen	48 (42%)
Did not have access to any of these	27 (24%)

Q3.8 When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

What was going to happen to you.....	44 (40%)
What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal	22 (20%)
How to make routine requests (applications).....	33 (30%)
Your entitlement to visits	39 (35%)
Health services	41 (37%)
Chaplaincy.....	32 (29%)
Not offered any information	47 (43%)

Q3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?

Yes	64 (56%)
No	38 (33%)
Don't remember	12 (11%)

Q3.10 How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?

Have not been on an induction course	34 (30%)
Within the first week	42 (37%)
More than a week	19 (17%)
Don't remember	20 (17%)

Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?

Have not been on an induction course	34 (30%)
Yes	33 (29%)
No	26 (23%)
Don't remember	21 (18%)

Q3.12 How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?

Did not receive an assessment	34 (30%)
Within the first week.....	9 (8%)
More than a week	34 (30%)
Don't remember	36 (32%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1 How easy is it to:

	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	19 (17%)	49 (45%)	19 (17%)	14 (13%)	5 (5%)	4 (4%)
Attend legal visits?	12 (11%)	39 (36%)	22 (20%)	19 (18%)	11 (10%)	5 (5%)
Get bail information?	4 (4%)	9 (10%)	17 (18%)	16 (17%)	7 (7%)	41 (44%)

Q4.2 Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?

Not had any letters	17 (15%)
Yes	81 (70%)
No	17 (15%)

Q4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?

Yes	32 (28%)
No	25 (22%)
Don't know	58 (50%)



Q4.4 Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:

	Yes	No	Don't know
Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	105 (92%)	6 (5%)	3 (3%)
Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	113 (99%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	78 (70%)	33 (29%)	1 (1%)
Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	95 (84%)	18 (16%)	0 (0%)
Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	36 (32%)	32 (29%)	44 (39%)
Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	89 (79%)	23 (20%)	1 (1%)
If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	27 (25%)	46 (42%)	36 (33%)

Q4.5 What is the food like here?

Very good	3 (3%)
Good.....	16 (14%)
Neither.....	21 (18%)
Bad	38 (33%)
Very bad	36 (32%)

Q4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?

Have not bought anything yet/don't know	2 (2%)
Yes	42 (37%)
No	70 (61%)

Q4.7 Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?

Yes	56 (50%)
No.....	7 (6%)
Don't know.....	49 (44%)

Q4.8 Are your religious beliefs respected?

Yes	55 (49%)
No	22 (20%)
Don't know/N/A.....	35 (31%)

Q4.9 Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?

Yes	79 (71%)
No.....	5 (4%)
Don't know/N/A.....	28 (25%)

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

I don't want to attend	29 (26%)
Very easy	16 (14%)
Easy.....	24 (21%)
Neither.....	8 (7%)
Difficult	13 (12%)
Very difficult.....	7 (6%)
Don't know.....	15 (13%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1 Is it easy to make an application?

Yes	82 (75%)
No.....	10 (9%)
Don't know.....	17 (16%)



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

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are applications dealt with fairly?	33 (32%)	35 (34%)	36 (35%)
Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	33 (34%)	44 (46%)	19 (20%)

Q5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?

Yes	82 (81%)
No	9 (9%)
Don't know	10 (10%)

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

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are complaints dealt with fairly?	27 (26%)	27 (26%)	50 (48%)
Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	27 (28%)	47 (48%)	23 (24%)

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

Yes	27 (26%)
No	77 (74%)

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

Don't know who they are	37 (34%)
Very easy	6 (5%)
Easy	20 (18%)
Neither	22 (20%)
Difficult	22 (20%)
Very difficult	3 (3%)

Section 6: Progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1 Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the progressive regimes and earned privileges (PREP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels).

Don't know what the PREP scheme is	10 (9%)
Yes	64 (58%)
No	26 (23%)
Don't know	11 (10%)

Q6.2 Do the different levels of the PREP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)

Don't know what the PREP scheme is	10 (9%)
Yes	45 (41%)
No	48 (44%)
Don't know	7 (6%)

Q6.3 In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?

Yes	4 (4%)
No	108 (96%)

Q6.4 If you have spent a night in the segregation and separation unit (SSU) in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?

I have not been to the SSU in the last 6 months	89 (86%)
Very well	1 (1%)
Well	2 (2%)
Neither	8 (8%)
Badly	3 (3%)
Very badly	1 (1%)





Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1 Do most staff treat you with respect?	
Yes	88 (79%)
No	23 (21%)
Q7.2 Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
Yes	70 (65%)
No	38 (35%)
Q7.3 Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
Yes	33 (29%)
No	79 (71%)
Q7.4 How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
<i>Do not go on association</i>	3 (3%)
Never.....	8 (7%)
Rarely.....	33 (29%)
Some of the time.....	38 (34%)
Most of the time.....	20 (18%)
All of the time.....	10 (9%)
Q7.5 When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
<i>I have not met him/her</i>	66 (60%)
<i>In the first week</i>	11 (10%)
<i>More than a week</i>	14 (13%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	19 (17%)
Q7.6 How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
<i>Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her</i>	66 (62%)
Very helpful.....	10 (9%)
Helpful	14 (13%)
Neither	9 (8%)
Not very helpful.....	6 (6%)
Not at all helpful	1 (1%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?			
Yes	60 (54%)		
No.....	51 (46%)		
Q8.2 Do you feel unsafe now?			
Yes	15 (14%)		
No.....	90 (86%)		
Q8.3 In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	51 (49%)	<i>At mealtimes</i>	5 (5%)
<i>Everywhere</i>	8 (8%)	<i>At health services</i>	17 (16%)
<i>SSU</i>	20 (19%)	<i>Visits area</i>	11 (11%)
<i>Association areas</i>	20 (19%)	<i>In wing showers</i>	8 (8%)
<i>Reception area</i>	10 (10%)	<i>In gym showers</i>	10 (10%)
<i>At the gym</i>	12 (12%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	10 (10%)
<i>In an exercise yard</i>	17 (16%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	13 (13%)
<i>At work</i>	8 (8%)	<i>In your cell</i>	6 (6%)
<i>During movement</i>	10 (10%)	<i>At religious services</i>	3 (3%)
<i>At education</i>	9 (9%)		



Q8.4 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?

Yes 44 (40%)
No..... 66 (60%)

Q8.5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)..... 23 (21%)
Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)..... 13 (12%)
Sexual abuse 3 (3%)
Feeling threatened or intimidated 23 (21%)
Having your canteen/property taken..... 4 (4%)
Medication 11 (10%)
Debt..... 6 (5%)
Drugs..... 7 (6%)
Your race or ethnic origin..... 9 (8%)
Your religion/religious beliefs 12 (11%)
Your nationality..... 11 (10%)
You are from a different part of the country than others 4 (4%)
You are from a traveller community 0 (0%)
Your sexual orientation 3 (3%)
Your age 1 (1%)
You have a disability..... 5 (5%)
You were new here 8 (7%)
Your offence/crime..... 16 (15%)
Gang related issues 7 (6%)

Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes 49 (45%)
No 59 (55%)

Q8.7 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)..... 28 (26%)
Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) 9 (8%)
Sexual abuse 2 (2%)
Feeling threatened or intimidated 25 (23%)
Medication 7 (6%)
Debt..... 2 (2%)
Drugs..... 5 (5%)
Your race or ethnic origin..... 6 (6%)
Your religion/religious beliefs 17 (16%)
Your nationality..... 13 (12%)
You are from a different part of the country than others 6 (6%)
You are from a traveller community 0 (0%)
Your sexual orientation..... 1 (1%)
Your age 1 (1%)
You have a disability..... 1 (1%)
You were new here 9 (8%)
Your offence/crime..... 17 (16%)
Gang related issues 5 (5%)

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

Not been victimised..... 47 (46%)
Yes 17 (17%)
No 38 (37%)





Section 9: Health services

Q9.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	4 (4%)	9 (8%)	42 (38%)	13 (12%)	30 (27%)	14 (13%)
The nurse	5 (5%)	15 (14%)	54 (51%)	13 (12%)	17 (16%)	2 (2%)
The dentist	11 (10%)	5 (5%)	19 (18%)	9 (8%)	40 (37%)	23 (21%)

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

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	5 (5%)	15 (14%)	39 (35%)	20 (18%)	19 (17%)	12 (11%)
The nurse	4 (4%)	21 (20%)	40 (38%)	18 (17%)	16 (15%)	7 (7%)
The dentist	14 (13%)	24 (23%)	28 (26%)	21 (20%)	12 (11%)	7 (7%)

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

<i>Not been</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Very good</i>	8 (7%)
<i>Good</i>	29 (26%)
<i>Neither</i>	24 (22%)
<i>Bad</i>	27 (24%)
<i>Very bad</i>	20 (18%)

Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes	77 (69%)
No	34 (31%)

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

<i>Not taking medication</i>	34 (30%)
Yes, all my meds.....	67 (60%)
Yes, some of my meds.....	10 (9%)
No.....	1 (1%)

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

Yes	33 (30%)
No	77 (70%)

Q9.7 Are you being helped/supported by anyone in this prison? (E.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)

<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	77 (71%)
Yes	17 (16%)
No	14 (13%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1 Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?

Yes	29 (26%)
No	82 (74%)

Q10.2 Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?

Yes	43 (39%)
No	68 (61%)



Q10.3 Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?

Very easy 30 (27%)
 Easy..... 23 (21%)
 Neither..... 17 (15%)
 Difficult..... 4 (4%)
 Very difficult..... 2 (2%)
 Don't know..... 34 (31%)

Q10.4 Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?

Very easy 4 (4%)
 Easy 3 (3%)
 Neither 10 (9%)
 Difficult 14 (13%)
 Very difficult 20 (18%)
 Don't know 59 (54%)

Q10.5 Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?

Yes..... 9 (8%)
 No 102 (92%)

Q10.6 Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?

Yes 12 (11%)
 No 99 (89%)

Q10.7 Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?

Did not/do not have a drug problem..... 77 (70%)
 Yes 22 (20%)
 No 11 (10%)

Q10.8 Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem while in this prison?

Did not/do not have an alcohol problem..... 68 (65%)
 Yes 27 (26%)
 No 10 (10%)

Q10.9 Was the support or help you received while in this prison helpful?

Did not have a problem/did not receive help..... 74 (69%)
 Yes 26 (24%)
 No..... 7 (7%)

Section 11: Activities

Q11.1 How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities in this prison?

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
Prison job	7 (6%)	13 (12%)	36 (33%)	14 (13%)	22 (20%)	18 (16%)
Vocational or skills training	8 (8%)	10 (10%)	34 (32%)	13 (12%)	25 (24%)	15 (14%)
Education (including basic skills)	6 (6%)	14 (13%)	41 (39%)	17 (16%)	14 (13%)	12 (12%)
Offending behaviour programmes	14 (13%)	8 (8%)	35 (33%)	15 (14%)	20 (19%)	14 (13%)

Q11.2 Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Not involved in any of these..... 22 (21%)
 Prison job..... 74 (70%)
 Vocational or skills training..... 21 (20%)
 Education (including basic skills)..... 37 (35%)
 Offending behaviour programmes 29 (27%)





Q11.3 If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?

	Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
Prison job	12 (12%)	45 (44%)	39 (38%)	6 (6%)
Vocational or skills training	17 (21%)	36 (44%)	23 (28%)	6 (7%)
Education (including basic skills)	10 (12%)	52 (61%)	19 (22%)	4 (5%)
Offending behaviour programmes	16 (19%)	42 (51%)	16 (19%)	9 (11%)

Q11.4 How often do you usually go to the library?

Don't want to go	23 (21%)
Never	26 (24%)
Less than once a week	31 (28%)
About once a week	29 (27%)
More than once a week.....	0 (0%)

Q11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?

Don't use it	35 (33%)
Yes.....	27 (25%)
No	45 (42%)

Q11.6 How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?

Don't want to go	33 (30%)
0	17 (16%)
1 to 2	9 (8%)
3 to 5	41 (38%)
More than 5	9 (8%)

Q11.7 How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?

Don't want to go	19 (17%)
0	16 (15%)
1 to 2	33 (30%)
3 to 5	23 (21%)
More than 5.....	19 (17%)

Q11.8 How many times do you usually have association each week?

Don't want to go	2 (2%)
0.....	3 (3%)
1 to 2	1 (1%)
3 to 5	12 (11%)
More than 5	91 (83%)

Q11.9 How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)

Less than 2 hours	5 (5%)
2 to less than 4 hours.....	8 (7%)
4 to less than 6 hours	11 (10%)
6 to less than 8 hours	20 (18%)
8 to less than 10 hours.....	16 (15%)
10 hours or more.....	36 (33%)
Don't know.....	13 (12%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
Yes	36 (33%)
No	72 (67%)
Q12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
Yes	58 (53%)
No	52 (47%)
Q12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
Yes	14 (13%)
No	96 (87%)
Q12.4 How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
<i>I don't get visits</i>	14 (13%)
Very easy	13 (12%)
Easy	29 (27%)
Neither	14 (13%)
Difficult	23 (21%)
Very difficult	15 (14%)
Don't know	1 (1%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1 Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
<i>Not sentenced</i>	2 (2%)
Yes	62 (58%)
No	43 (40%)
Q13.2 What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison?	
<i>Not sentenced/N/A</i>	45 (44%)
No contact	10 (10%)
Letter	5 (5%)
Phone	2 (2%)
Visit	44 (43%)
Q13.3 Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
Yes	46 (45%)
No	56 (55%)
Q13.4 Do you have a sentence plan?	
<i>Not sentenced</i>	2 (2%)
Yes	65 (61%)
No	39 (37%)
Q13.5 How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	41 (38%)
Very involved	19 (18%)
Involved	22 (21%)
Neither	7 (7%)
Not very involved	9 (8%)
Not at all involved	9 (8%)



Q13.6 Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced..... 41 (39%)

Nobody..... 10 (9%)

Offender supervisor..... 13 (12%)

Offender manager..... 18 (17%)

Named/personal officer..... 11 (10%)

Staff from other departments..... 26 (25%)

No one 8 (8%)

Q13.7 Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced..... 41 (39%)

Yes..... 45 (43%)

No..... 6 (6%)

Don't know..... 13 (12%)

Q13.8 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced..... 41 (39%)

Yes..... 2 (2%)

No 52 (49%)

Don't know..... 11 (10%)

Q13.9 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced..... 41 (38%)

Yes..... 17 (16%)

No 22 (21%)

Don't know..... 27 (25%)

Q13.10 Do you have a needs based custody plan?

Yes 8 (8%)

No 49 (47%)

Don't know..... 48 (46%)

Q13.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?

Yes..... 17 (16%)

No 87 (84%)

Q13.12 Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	17 (17%)	18 (18%)	67 (66%)
Accommodation	17 (17%)	29 (29%)	55 (54%)
Benefits	13 (13%)	23 (23%)	66 (65%)
Finances	13 (14%)	13 (14%)	70 (73%)
Education	15 (15%)	18 (19%)	64 (66%)
Drugs and alcohol	21 (22%)	28 (29%)	48 (49%)

Q13.13 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

Not sentenced..... 2 (2%)

Yes..... 59 (55%)

No 47 (44%)

Survey results - Bush

Section 1: About you

In order for us to ensure that everyone is treated equally within this prison, we ask that you fill in the following information about yourself. This will allow us to look at the answers provided by different groups of people in order to detect discrimination and to investigate whether there are equal opportunities for everyone across all areas of prison life. Your responses to these questions will remain both anonymous and confidential.

Q1.2 How old are you?

Under 21	0 (0%)
21 - 29	2 (22%)
30 - 39	3 (33%)
40 - 49	2 (22%)
50 - 59	2 (22%)
60 - 69	0 (0%)
70 and over.....	0 (0%)

Q1.3 Are you sentenced?

Yes	8 (89%)
Yes - on recall	1 (11%)
No - awaiting trial.....	0 (0%)
No - awaiting sentence.....	0 (0%)
No - awaiting deportation.....	0 (0%)

Q1.4 How long is your sentence?

Not sentenced	0 (0%)
Less than 6 months	0 (0%)
6 months to less than 1 year	0 (0%)
1 year to less than 2 years	1 (11%)
2 years to less than 4 years.....	0 (0%)
4 years to less than 10 years	0 (0%)
10 years or more.....	3 (33%)
ICS/ECS	1 (11%)
Life.....	4 (44%)

Q1.5 Do you hold UK citizenship?

Yes	9 (100%)
No.....	0 (0%)

Q1.6 Do you understand spoken English?

Yes	9 (100%)
No.....	0 (0%)

Q1.7 Do you understand written English?

Yes	9 (100%)
No.....	0 (0%)



Q1.8 What is your ethnic origin?

White - British.....	8 (89%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese.....	0 (0%)
White - Irish.....	1 (11%)	Asian or Asian British - other.....	0 (0%)
White - other.....	0 (0%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean.....	0 (0%)
Black or black British - Caribbean.....	0 (0%)	Mixed race - white and black African.....	0 (0%)
Black or black British - African.....	0 (0%)	Mixed race - white and Asian.....	0 (0%)
Black or black British - other.....	0 (0%)	Mixed race - other.....	0 (0%)
Asian or Asian British - Indian.....	0 (0%)	Arab.....	0 (0%)
Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	0 (0%)	Other ethnic group.....	0 (0%)
Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	0 (0%)		

Q1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?

Yes.....	0 (0%)
No.....	9 (100%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

None.....	0 (0%)	Buddhist.....	0 (0%)
Church of Ireland.....	3 (33%)	Hindu.....	0 (0%)
Catholic.....	0 (0%)	Jewish.....	0 (0%)
Protestant.....	6 (67%)	Muslim.....	0 (0%)
Presbyterian.....	0 (0%)	Sikh.....	0 (0%)
Methodist.....	0 (0%)	Other.....	0 (0%)
Other Christian denomination.....	0 (0%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

Heterosexual/straight.....	9 (100%)
Homosexual/gay.....	0 (0%)
Bisexual.....	0 (0%)

Q1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs)?

Yes.....	1 (11%)
No.....	8 (89%)

Q1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?

Yes.....	0 (0%)
No.....	9 (100%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes.....	0 (0%)
No.....	9 (100%)

Q1.15 Do you have children under the age of 18?

Yes.....	5 (56%)
No.....	4 (44%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1 On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?

Less than 2 hours.....	7 (78%)
2 hours or longer.....	1 (11%)
Don't remember.....	1 (11%)



- Q2.2 On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?**
My journey was less than two hours..... 7 (78%)
 Yes..... 0 (0%)
 No..... 1 (11%)
 Don't remember 1 (11%)
- Q2.3 On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?**
My journey was less than two hours..... 7 (78%)
 Yes..... 0 (0%)
 No..... 1 (11%)
 Don't remember 1 (11%)
- Q2.4 On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?**
 Yes 4 (44%)
 No..... 4 (44%)
 Don't remember 1 (11%)
- Q2.5 On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?**
 Yes 4 (44%)
 No..... 4 (44%)
 Don't remember 1 (11%)
- Q2.6 On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?**
 Very well..... 1 (11%)
 Well..... 4 (44%)
 Neither..... 3 (33%)
 Badly..... 0 (0%)
 Very badly 0 (0%)
 Don't remember 1 (11%)
- Q2.7 Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
 Yes, someone told me 6 (67%)
 Yes, I received written information..... 2 (22%)
 No, I was not told anything 1 (11%)
 Don't remember..... 0 (0%)
- Q2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?**
 Yes 6 (67%)
 No..... 3 (33%)
 Don't remember..... 0 (0%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

- Q3.1 How long were you in reception?**
 Less than 2 hours..... 5 (56%)
 2 hours or longer..... 4 (44%)
 Don't remember..... 0 (0%)
- Q3.2 When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?**
 Yes 6 (67%)
 No 3 (33%)
 Don't remember..... 0 (0%)





Q3.3 Overall, how were you treated in reception?

Very well.....	1 (11%)
Well.....	3 (33%)
Neither.....	5 (56%)
Badly.....	0 (0%)
Very badly.....	0 (0%)
Don't remember.....	0 (0%)

Q3.4 Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you).

Loss of property.....	1 (11%)
Physical health.....	0 (0%)
Housing problems.....	0 (0%)
Mental health.....	2 (22%)
Contacting employers.....	0 (0%)
Needing protection from other prisoners.....	3 (33%)
Contacting family.....	3 (33%)
Getting phone numbers.....	2 (22%)
Childcare.....	0 (0%)
Money worries.....	1 (11%)
Feeling depressed or suicidal.....	1 (11%)
Other.....	0 (0%)
Did not have any problems	4 (44%)

Q3.5 Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?

Yes.....	1 (11%)
No.....	4 (44%)
Did not have any problems	4 (44%)

Q3.6 When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you).

Tobacco.....	3 (33%)
A shower.....	4 (44%)
A free telephone call.....	8 (89%)
Something to eat.....	7 (78%)
PIN phone credit.....	4 (44%)
Toiletries/basic items.....	4 (44%)
Did not receive anything	0 (0%)

Q3.7 When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you).

Chaplain.....	2 (25%)
Someone from health services.....	3 (38%)
A Listener/Samaritans.....	0 (0%)
Tuck shop/canteen.....	4 (50%)
Did not have access to any of these	2 (25%)

Q3.8 When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

What was going to happen to you.....	5 (56%)
What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	2 (22%)
How to make routine requests (applications).....	3 (33%)
Your entitlement to visits.....	5 (56%)
Health services.....	3 (33%)
Chaplaincy.....	1 (11%)
Not offered any information	2 (22%)



Q3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?

Yes 5 (56%)
 No..... 4 (44%)
 Don't remember..... 0 (0%)

Q3.10 How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?

Have not been on an induction course..... 4 (44%)
 Within the first week 4 (44%)
 More than a week..... 1 (11%)
 Don't remember..... 0 (0%)

Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?

Have not been on an induction course..... 4 (44%)
 Yes 2 (22%)
 No..... 2 (22%)
 Don't remember 1 (11%)

Q3.12 How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?

Did not receive an assessment 4 (44%)
 Within the first week 1 (11%)
 More than a week..... 4 (44%)
 Don't remember..... 0 (0%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1 How easy is it to:

	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	3 (33%)	4 (44%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Attend legal visits?	3 (38%)	4 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Get bail information?	2 (25%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	4 (50%)

Q4.2 Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?

Not had any letters.....1 (11%)
 Yes 5 (56%)
 No..... 3 (33%)

Q4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?

Yes 5 (56%)
 No..... 2 (22%)
 Don't know2 (22%)

Q4.4 Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:

	Yes	No	Don't know
Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)
Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)
Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	5 (63%)	3 (38%)	0 (0%)
Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	6 (75%)	2 (25%)	0 (0%)
If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	5 (56%)	4 (44%)	0 (0%)





Q4.5 What is the food like here?

Very good	0 (0%)
Good	2 (22%)
Neither	4 (44%)
Bad	3 (33%)
Very bad	0 (0%)

Q4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?

Have not bought anything yet/don't know	0 (0%)
Yes	4 (44%)
No.....	5 (56%)

Q4.7 Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?

Yes	5 (56%)
No.....	1 (11%)
Don't know	3 (33%)

Q4.8 Are your religious beliefs respected?

Yes	6 (67%)
No.....	1 (11%)
Don't know/N/A	2 (22%)

Q4.9 Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?

Yes	7 (78%)
No.....	0 (0%)
Don't know/N/A	2 (22%)

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

I don't want to attend	0 (0%)
Very easy.....	6 (67%)
Easy	3 (33%)
Neither	0 (0%)
Difficult.....	0 (0%)
Very difficult.....	0 (0%)
Don't know	0 (0%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1 Is it easy to make an application?

Yes	7 (78%)
No	1 (11%)
Don't know	1 (11%)

Q5.2 Please answer the following questions about applications:

(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are applications dealt with fairly?	2 (22%)	3 (33%)	4 (44%)
Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	2 (29%)	4 (57%)	1 (14%)

Q5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?

Yes	8 (89%)
No	1 (11%)
Don't know	0 (0%)



Q5.4 Please answer the following questions about complaints:

(If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are complaints dealt with fairly?	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	7 (78%)
Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	2 (22%)	5 (56%)	2 (22%)

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

Yes	3 (33%)
No.....	6 (67%)

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

Don't know who they are	3 (33%)
Very easy.....	4 (44%)
Easy	0 (0%)
Neither.....	1 (11%)
Difficult	1 (11%)
Very difficult.....	0 (0%)

Section 6: Progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1 Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the progressive regimes and earned privileges (PREP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)

Don't know what the PREP scheme is	0 (0%)
Yes	6 (67%)
No	3 (33%)
Don't know	0 (0%)

Q6.2 Do the different levels of the PREP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels).

Don't know what the PREP scheme is	0 (0%)
Yes	3 (38%)
No.....	5 (63%)
Don't know.....	0 (0%)

Q6.3 In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?

Yes	1 (11%)
No.....	8 (89%)

Q6.4 If you have spent a night in the segregation and separation unit (SSU) in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?

I have not been to the SSU in the last 6 months	6 (67%)
Very well	0 (0%)
Well.....	1 (11%)
Neither	0 (0%)
Badly	1 (11%)
Very badly.....	1 (11%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1 Do most staff treat you with respect?

Yes	7 (78%)
No.....	2 (22%)





- Q7.2 Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?**
 Yes 5 (56%)
 No..... 4 (44%)
- Q7.3 Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?**
 Yes 3 (33%)
 No..... 6 (67%)
- Q7.4 How often do staff normally speak to you during association?**
Do not go on association..... 0 (0%)
 Never..... 2 (22%)
 Rarely 0 (0%)
 Some of the time 2 (22%)
 Most of the time..... 1 (11%)
 All of the time..... 4 (44%)
- Q7.5 When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?**
I have not met him/her..... 5 (56%)
 In the first week 0 (0%)
 More than a week..... 1 (11%)
 Don't remember 3 (33%)
- Q7.6 How helpful is your personal (named) officer?**
Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her 5 (63%)
 Very helpful 1 (13%)
 Helpful..... 1 (13%)
 Neither 0 (0%)
 Not very helpful..... 0 (0%)
 Not at all helpful 1 (13%)

Section 8: Safety

- Q8.1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?**
 Yes 5 (56%)
 No..... 4 (44%)
- Q8.2 Do you feel unsafe now?**
 Yes 2 (22%)
 No..... 7 (78%)
- Q8.3 In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you).**
- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| Never felt unsafe 4 (44%) | At mealtimes 0 (0%) |
| Everywhere 1 (11%) | At health services 0 (0%) |
| SSU..... 2 (22%) | Visits area 1 (11%) |
| Association areas..... 0 (0%) | In wing showers 0 (0%) |
| Reception area 0 (0%) | In gym showers 0 (0%) |
| At the gym 1 (11%) | In corridors/stairwells..... 1 (11%) |
| In an exercise yard 1 (11%) | On your landing/wing 0 (0%) |
| At work 0 (0%) | In your cell 0 (0%) |
| During movement..... 2 (22%) | At religious services 0 (0%) |
| At education 1 (11%) | |



Q8.4 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?

Yes 5 (56%)
No..... 4 (44%)

Q8.5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you).

Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends) 4 (44%)
Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) 0 (0%)
Sexual abuse 0 (0%)
Feeling threatened or intimidated..... 4 (44%)
Having your canteen/property taken 0 (0%)
Medication 0 (0%)
Debt..... 0 (0%)
Drugs..... 0 (0%)
Your race or ethnic origin..... 0 (0%)
Your religion/religious beliefs..... 5 (56%)
Your nationality 2 (22%)
You are from a different part of the country than others 0 (0%)
You are from a Traveller community 0 (0%)
Your sexual orientation 0 (0%)
Your age 0 (0%)
You have a disability..... 0 (0%)
You were new here 0 (0%)
Your offence/crime..... 1 (11%)
Gang related issues 1 (11%)

Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes 2 (22%)
No..... 7 (78%)

Q8.7 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you).

Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends) 1 (11%)
Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) 1 (11%)
Sexual abuse 0 (0%)
Feeling threatened or intimidated..... 1 (11%)
Medication..... 0 (0%)
Debt 0 (0%)
Drugs..... 0 (0%)
Your race or ethnic origin..... 0 (0%)
Your religion/religious beliefs..... 2 (22%)
Your nationality 1 (11%)
You are from a different part of the country than others 0 (0%)
You are from a traveller community 0 (0%)
Your sexual orientation..... 0 (0%)
Your age 0 (0%)
You have a disability..... 1 (11%)
You were new here 0 (0%)
Your offence/crime..... 1 (11%)
Gang related issues 0 (0%)

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

Not been victimised..... 4 (67%)
Yes..... 0 (0%)
No..... 2 (33%)





Section 9: Health services

Q9.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?

	Don't know	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	3 (33%)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	1 (11%)
The nurse	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	5 (56%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)
The dentist	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	3 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)

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

	Not been	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	6 (67%)	0 (0%)
The nurse	1 (11%)	3 (33%)	3 (33%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)
The dentist	0 (0%)	5 (56%)	3 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)

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

Not been	0 (0%)
<i>Very good</i>	1 (11%)
<i>Good</i>	3 (33%)
<i>Neither</i>	2 (22%)
<i>Bad</i>	3 (33%)
<i>Very bad</i>	0 (0%)

Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes	7 (78%)
No	2 (22%)

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

Not taking medication	2 (22%)
Yes, all my meds	7 (78%)
Yes, some of my meds	0 (0%)
No	0 (0%)

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

Yes	3 (33%)
No	6 (67%)

Q9.7 Are you being helped/supported by anyone in this prison? (E.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)

Do not have any emotional or mental health problems	6 (75%)
Yes	1 (13%)
No	1 (13%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1 Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?

Yes	3 (33%)
No	6 (67%)

Q10.2 Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?

Yes	2 (22%)
No	7 (78%)



Q10.3 Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?

Very easy.....	2 (25%)
Easy	0 (0%)
Neither	0 (0%)
Difficult.....	0 (0%)
Very difficult.....	1 (13%)
Don't know	5 (63%)

Q10.4 Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?

Very easy.....	0 (0%)
Easy	0 (0%)
Neither	0 (0%)
Difficult	1 (13%)
Very difficult.....	1 (13%)
Don't know	6 (75%)

Q10.5 Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?

Yes	1 (11%)
No.....	8 (89%)

Q10.6 Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?

Yes	1 (11%)
No.....	8 (89%)

Q10.7 Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem while in this prison?

<i>Did not/do not have a drug problem</i>	6 (67%)
Yes	2 (22%)
No.....	1 (11%)

Q10.8 Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem while in this prison?

<i>Did not/do not have an alcohol problem</i>	7 (88%)
Yes.....	0 (0%)
No.....	1 (13%)

Q10.9 Was the support or help you received while in this prison helpful?

<i>Did not have a problem/did not receive help</i>	6 (75%)
Yes	1 (13%)
No	1 (13%)

Section 11: Activities

Q11.1 How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
Prison job	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	4 (44%)
Vocational or skills training	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)
Education (including basic skills)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	3 (33%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)
Offending behaviour programmes	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	3 (33%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)

Q11.2 Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you).

<i>Not involved in any of these</i>	2 (25%)
Prison job.....	4 (50%)
Vocational or skills training.....	2 (25%)
Education (including basic skills).....	5 (63%)
Offending behaviour programmes.....	2 (25%)





Q11.3 If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?

	Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
Prison job	3 (33%)	0 (0%)	6 (67%)	0 (0%)
Vocational or skills training	2 (29%)	2 (29%)	3 (43%)	0 (0%)
Education (including basic skills)	2 (22%)	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	0 (0%)
Offending behaviour programmes	2 (29%)	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	0 (0%)

Q11.4 How often do you usually go to the library?

Don't want to go	1 (11%)
Never.....	0 (0%)
Less than once a week	6 (67%)
About once a week.....	2 (22%)
More than once a week.....	0 (0%)

Q11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?

Don't use it	1 (11%)
Yes	4 (44%)
No.....	4 (44%)

Q11.6 How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?

Don't want to go	2 (22%)
0	2 (22%)
1 to 2	0 (0%)
3 to 5	5 (56%)
More than 5	0 (0%)

Q11.7 How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?

Don't want to go	0 (0%)
0	1 (11%)
1 to 2	2 (22%)
3 to 5	2 (22%)
More than 5.....	4 (44%)

Q11.8 How many times do you usually have association each week?

Don't want to go	0 (0%)
0.....	0 (0%)
1 to 2	2 (22%)
3 to 5	0 (0%)
More than 5	7 (78%)

Q11.9 How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a week day? (Please include hours at education, at work etc).

Less than 2 hours.....	1 (11%)
2 to less than 4 hours.....	0 (0%)
4 to less than 6 hours.....	0 (0%)
6 to less than 8 hours.....	0 (0%)
8 to less than 10 hours.....	1 (11%)
10 hours or more	7 (78%)
Don't know	0 (0%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

- Q12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?**
- | | |
|-----------|---------|
| Yes | 5 (56%) |
| No..... | 4 (44%) |
- Q12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?**
- | | |
|-----------|---------|
| Yes | 4 (44%) |
| No..... | 5 (56%) |
- Q12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?**
- | | |
|----------|----------|
| Yes..... | 0 (0%) |
| No | 9 (100%) |
- Q12.4 How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?**
- | | |
|--------------------------|---------|
| I don't get visits | 0 (0%) |
| Very easy..... | 2 (22%) |
| Easy | 2 (22%) |
| Neither..... | 2 (22%) |
| Difficult | 2 (22%) |
| Very difficult..... | 1 (11%) |
| Don't know | 0 (0%) |

Section 13: Preparation for release

- Q13.1 Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?**
- | | |
|--------------------|---------|
| Not sentenced..... | 0 (0%) |
| Yes | 5 (56%) |
| No..... | 4 (44%) |
- Q13.2 What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison?**
- | | |
|-----------------------|---------|
| Not sentenced/NA..... | 4 (44%) |
| No contact..... | 0 (0%) |
| Letter | 1 (11%) |
| Phone..... | 0 (0%) |
| Visit..... | 4 (44%) |
- Q13.3 Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?**
- | | |
|-----------|---------|
| Yes | 4 (44%) |
| No | 5 (56%) |
- Q13.4 Do you have a sentence plan?**
- | | |
|--------------------|---------|
| Not sentenced..... | 0 (0%) |
| Yes | 3 (33%) |
| No..... | 6 (67%) |
- Q13.5 How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?**
- | | |
|---|---------|
| Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced | 6 (67%) |
| Very involved..... | 1 (11%) |
| Involved..... | 2 (22%) |
| Neither..... | 0 (0%) |
| Not very involved | 0 (0%) |
| Not at all involved..... | 0 (0%) |



Q13.6 Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you).

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced 6 (67%)
 Nobody..... 1 (11%)
 Offender supervisor 2 (22%)
 Offender manager 1 (11%)
 Named/personal officer 0 (0%)
 Staff from other departments 0 (0%)
 No one 0 (0%)

Q13.7 Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced 6 (67%)
 Yes 3 (33%)
 No 0 (0%)
 Don't know 0 (0%)

Q13.8 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced 6 (75%)
 Yes..... 0 (0%)
 No..... 2 (25%)
 Don't know 0 (0%)

Q13.9 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced 6 (67%)
 Yes 1 (11%)
 No..... 2 (22%)
 Don't know 0 (0%)

Q13.10 Do you have a needs based custody plan?

Yes 1 (11%)
 No..... 7 (78%)
 Don't know 1 (11%)

Q13.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?

Yes 2 (22%)
 No..... 7 (78%)

Q13.12 Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (Please tick all that apply to you).

	Do not need help	Yes	No
Employment	3 (33%)	1 (11%)	5 (56%)
Accommodation	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	4 (44%)
Benefits	4 (44%)	2 (22%)	3 (33%)
Finances	4 (50%)	1 (13%)	3 (38%)
Education	4 (44%)	2 (22%)	3 (33%)
Drugs and alcohol	4 (44%)	2 (22%)	3 (33%)

Q13.13 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

Not sentenced 0 (0%)
 Yes..... 5 (56%)
 No..... 4 (44%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012

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

Key to tables

		Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012	Local prisons comparator	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		176	5518	176	106
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	6%	0%	1%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	43%	67%	43%	48%
1.3	Are you on recall?	3%	10%	3%	4%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	14%	19%	14%	8%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (ICS/ECS prisoner)?	1%	3%	1%	0%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	13%	12%	13%	13%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	99%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	98%	97%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	5%	26%	5%	8%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	1%	5%	1%	
1.10	Are you Muslim?	0%	11%	0%	1%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	3%	2%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	39%	19%	39%	25%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	7%	8%	7%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	28%	29%	28%	27%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	61%	54%	61%	61%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than two hours in the van?	28%	18%	28%	21%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	22%	38%	22%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	7%	6%	7%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	50%	70%	50%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	63%	81%	63%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	55%	65%	55%	53%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	68%	69%	68%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	4%	4%	4%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	70%	81%	70%	68%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012	Local prisons comparator	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than two hours?	43%	63%	43%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	59%	74%	59%	53%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	53%	58%	53%	46%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	83%	76%	83%	72%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	12%	14%	12%	9%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	27%	25%	27%	23%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	7%	2%	6%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	30%	34%	30%	18%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	6%	8%	6%	10%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	33%	23%	33%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	31%	22%	31%	27%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	23%	18%	23%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	34%	19%	34%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	14%	9%	14%	12%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	28%	31%	28%	12%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	38%	43%	38%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	38%	86%	38%	49%
3.6	A shower?	69%	33%	69%	45%
3.6	A free telephone call?	72%	57%	72%	68%
3.6	Something to eat?	61%	80%	61%	71%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	49%	52%	49%	
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	59%	63%	59%	
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	57%	51%	57%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	64%	74%	64%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	24%	39%	24%	
3.7	Tuck shop/canteen?	51%	15%	51%	52%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	42%	47%	42%	35%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	40%	47%	40%	25%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	38%	38%	38%	35%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	44%	45%	44%	39%
3.8	Health services?	46%	51%	46%	34%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	45%	48%	45%	30%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012	Local prisons comparator	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2009
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?	63%	72%	63%	64%
3.10 Have you been on an induction course?	80%	77%	80%	80%
For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11 Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	49%	59%	49%	44%
3.12 Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	61%	75%	61%	
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody				
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1 Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	55%	41%	55%	54%
4.1 Attend legal visits?	68%	59%	68%	68%
4.1 Get bail information?	32%	24%	32%	37%
4.2 Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	48%	40%	48%	61%
4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?	22%	32%	22%	
For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4 Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	85%	52%	85%	69%
4.4 Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	92%	81%	92%	86%
4.4 Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	83%	82%	83%	96%
4.4 Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	79%	63%	79%	74%
4.4 Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	41%	38%	41%	33%
4.4 Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	61%	64%	61%	55%
4.4 Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	26%	28%	26%	38%
4.5 Is the food in this prison good/very good?	15%	24%	15%	20%
4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	60%	46%	60%	51%
4.7 Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	50%	59%	50%	52%
4.8 Are your religious beliefs respected?	56%	55%	56%	62%
4.9 Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	64%	56%	64%	67%
4.10 Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	42%	44%	42%	
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints				
5.1 Is it easy to make an application?	57%	81%	57%	
For those who have made an application:				
5.2 Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	47%	56%	47%	37%
5.2 Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	59%	47%	59%	47%
5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?	62%	58%	62%	
For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4 Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	43%	30%	43%	24%
5.4 Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	56%	34%	56%	40%
5.5 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	28%	15%	28%	
5.6 Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	12%	22%	12%	26%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012	Local prisons comparator	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the PREP scheme?	42%	49%	42%	
6.2	Do the different levels of the PREP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	43%	44%	43%	
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	15%	7%	15%	
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	40%	52%	40%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	81%	70%	81%	73%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	68%	71%	68%	57%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	35%	42%	35%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	22%	18%	22%	13%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	37%	46%	37%	29%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	75%	63%	75%	60%
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	52%	41%	52%	56%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	22%	17%	22%	19%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	39%	21%	39%	31%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	22%	11%	22%	15%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	7%	7%	7%	13%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	4%	1%	4%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	23%	14%	23%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	5%	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	8%	5%	8%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	4%	2%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	4%	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	7%	4%	7%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	8%	2%	8%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	7%	2%	7%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	7%	4%	7%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller Community?	1%	0%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	3%	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	6%	4%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	13%	5%	13%	15%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	7%	4%	7%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012	Local prisons comparator	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	36%	26%	36%	47%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	21%	12%	21%	18%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	8%	5%	8%	12%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	5%	1%	5%	4%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	18%	10%	18%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	8%	6%	8%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	1%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	5%	3%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	5%	5%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	8%	3%	8%	11%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	7%	2%	7%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	3%	4%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller Community?	1%	1%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	2%	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	6%	2%	10%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	8%	5%	8%	13%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	2%	4%	
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	47%	34%	47%	36%
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	33%	27%	33%	25%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	61%	52%	61%	73%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	16%	10%	16%	18%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	40%	44%	40%	26%
9.2	The nurse?	59%	58%	59%	60%
9.2	The dentist?	36%	32%	36%	49%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	43%	40%	43%	33%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	67%	50%	67%	58%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	91%	67%	91%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	51%	34%	51%	57%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	49%	46%	49%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012	Local prisons comparator	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	29%	36%	29%	37%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	33%	26%	33%	45%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	38%	29%	38%	41%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	10%	11%	10%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	9%	9%	9%	15%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	11%	10%	11%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	46%	48%	46%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	45%	48%	45%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	78%	78%	78%	69%
SECTION 11: Activities					
	Is it very easy/easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1	A prison job?	18%	38%	18%	
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	29%	30%	29%	
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	47%	47%	47%	
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	18%	22%	18%	
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2	A prison job?	43%	44%	43%	31%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	37%	10%	37%	6%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	12%	27%	12%	27%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	36%	7%	36%	14%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	59%	69%	59%	
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	46%	42%	46%	
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	52%	54%	52%	
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	44%	50%	44%	
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	59%	65%	59%	
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	59%	59%	59%	
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	44%	51%	44%	
	For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	39%	48%	39%	
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	22%	37%	22%	21%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	21%	27%	21%	
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	37%	31%	37%	32%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	50%	38%	50%	56%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012	Local prisons comparator	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	46%	50%	46%	50%
11.9	Do you spend 10 or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	8%	9%	8%	10%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	52%	35%	52%	40%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	28%	46%	28%	59%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	31%	33%	31%	26%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your friends and family to get here?	26%	35%	26%	
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	49%	54%	49%	
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:				
13.2	No contact?	17%	45%	17%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	0%	21%	0%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	0%	12%	0%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	83%	37%	83%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	23%	25%	23%	
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	55%	41%	55%	31%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	64%	57%	64%	46%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
13.6	Nobody?	21%	54%	21%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	21%	27%	21%	
13.6	Offender manager?	39%	24%	39%	
13.6	Named/personal officer?	25%	15%	25%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	29%	18%	29%	
	For those with a sentence plan:				
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	67%	63%	67%	57%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	11%		11%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	42%		42%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	9%	4%	9%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	14%	15%	14%	13%
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:				
13.12	Employment?	23%	29%	23%	
13.12	Accommodation?	35%	41%	35%	
13.12	Benefits?	29%	44%	29%	
13.12	Finances?	18%	29%	18%	
13.12	Education?	27%	37%	27%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012	Local prisons comparator	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012	Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	32%	51%	32%	
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	48%	47%	48%	56%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (nationality) Maghaberry Prison 2012

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

Key to tables

		Foreign national prisoners	British national prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		23	149
1.3	Are you sentenced?	39%	43%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?		
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	89%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	76%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	33%	1%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	10%	0%
1.10	Are you Muslim?	0%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	18%	41%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	7%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	43%	26%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	43%	57%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	34%	71%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	57%	61%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	45%	54%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	86%	83%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from healthcare when you first arrived here?	67%	64%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	59%	65%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	87%	78%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	48%	56%

Key to tables

		Foreign national prisoners	British national prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	87%	85%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	85%	94%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	58%	40%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	9%	16%
4.6	Does the tuck shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	43%	64%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	33%	52%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	57%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	55%	65%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	54%	57%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	66%	61%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the PREP scheme?	15%	46%
6.2	Do the different levels of the PREP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	24%	45%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	20%	14%
7.1	Do most staff in this prison treat you with respect?	79%	81%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	53%	71%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	16%	23%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	42%	35%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	59%	51%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	30%	21%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	50%	37%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	14%	25%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	27%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	9%	8%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	23%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	5%	4%

Key to tables

		Foreign national prisoners	British national prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	50%	33%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	14%	18%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	27%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	5%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	23%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	5%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	21%	35%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	63%	60%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	48%	70%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	48%	51%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	27%	39%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	35%	43%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	40%	37%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	15%	11%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	45%	34%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	40%	18%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	58%	34%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	48%	49%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	33%	47%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	10%	7%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	28%	27%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	39%	29%

Catholic vs Protestant comparator



Prisoner survey responses Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012: Comparison of responses for Protestant vs Roman Catholic prisoners

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

Key to tables

		Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		82	51
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	46%	45%
1.3	Are you on recall?	6%	0%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	16%	12%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (ICS/ECS prisoner)?	0%	2%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	12%	2%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	95%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	0%	0%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	1%	0%
1.10	Are you Muslim?	0%	0%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	50%	35%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	12%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	25%	25%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	61%	62%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than two hours in the van?	31%	23%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	20%	27%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	10%	7%
2.4	Was the van clean?	44%	55%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	64%	68%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	51%	62%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	67%	72%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	4%	6%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	67%	76%

Catholic vs Protestant comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than two hours?	36%	55%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	51%	65%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	47%	61%
When you first arrived:			
3.4	Did you have any problems?	79%	88%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	15%	8%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	20%	34%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	29%	30%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2%	12%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	34%	30%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	28%	40%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	25%	24%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	39%	34%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	11%	18%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	29%	30%
For those with problems:			
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	40%	38%
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:			
3.6	Tobacco?	38%	37%
3.6	A shower?	70%	67%
3.6	A free telephone call?	78%	73%
3.6	Something to eat?	60%	63%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	51%	49%
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	61%	61%
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people/services:			
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	56%	55%
3.7	Someone from health services?	61%	63%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	28%	24%
3.7	Tuck shop/ canteen?	48%	59%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:			
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	46%	40%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	41%	44%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	40%	42%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	45%	50%

Catholic vs Protestant comparator

Key to tables

		Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
3.8	Health services?	44%	50%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	45%	40%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	63%	63%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	76%	84%
For those who have been on an induction course:			
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	54%	45%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	63%	64%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:			
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	55%	52%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	65%	74%
4.1	Get bail information?	35%	25%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	51%	47%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	24%	19%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:			
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	89%	81%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	93%	89%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	82%	79%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	79%	81%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	40%	36%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	61%	60%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	30%	25%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	10%	19%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	61%	65%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	49%	57%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	62%	51%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	65%	63%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	38%	47%

Catholic vs Protestant comparator

Key to tables

		Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	53%	60%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	48%	56%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	58%	61%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	54%	70%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	33%	50%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	46%	58%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	27%	31%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	11%	12%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the PREP scheme?	40%	57%
6.2	Do the different levels of the PREP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	43%	49%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	21%	4%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation and separation unit, were you treated very well/well by staff?	42%	36%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	78%	79%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	65%	77%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	37%	35%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	18%	28%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	41%	28%
	For those with a personal officer:		
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	83%	54%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	48%	49%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	21%	22%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	37%	37%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	16%	25%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	6%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	5%	4%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	24%	25%

Catholic vs Protestant comparator

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety continued		
8.5 Taken your canteen/property?	1%	2%
8.5 Victimised you because of medication?	8%	12%
8.5 Victimised you because of debt?	2%	4%
8.5 Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	4%
8.5 Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	6%
8.5 Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	15%
8.5 Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	11%
8.5 Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	12%
8.5 Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%	0%
8.5 Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.5 Victimised you because of your age?	0%	2%
8.5 Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	6%
8.5 Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	4%
8.5 Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	9%	17%
8.5 Victimised you because of gang related issues?	10%	6%
8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?	35%	34%
Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7 Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	22%	21%
8.7 Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	9%	4%
8.7 Sexually abused you?	7%	2%
8.7 Threatened or intimidated you?	18%	23%
8.7 Victimised you because of medication?	12%	6%
8.7 Victimised you because of debt?	2%	0%
8.7 Victimised you because of drugs?	5%	2%
8.7 Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	2%
8.7 Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	9%	4%
8.7 Victimised you because of your nationality?	9%	6%
8.7 Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	4%
8.7 Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%	0%
8.7 Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.7 Victimised you because of your age?	1%	0%
8.7 Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	4%

Catholic vs Protestant comparator

Key to tables

		Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	1%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	9%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	8%	0%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	57%	47%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	37%	23%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	58%	55%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	23%	4%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:		
9.2	The doctor?	33%	41%
9.2	The nurse?	54%	58%
9.2	The dentist?	38%	30%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	40%	42%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	77%	63%
	For those currently taking medication:		
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	89%	90%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	59%	42%
	For those who have problems:		
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	56%	37%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	32%	29%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	35%	27%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	39%	43%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	3%	17%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	13%	8%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	16%	6%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	48%	29%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	43%	42%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
10.9	Was the support helpful?	78%	63%

Catholic vs Protestant comparator

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 11: Activities		
Is it very easy/easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1 A prison job?	16%	22%
11.1 Vocational or skills training?	27%	33%
11.1 Education (including basic skills)?	44%	47%
11.1 Offending Behaviour Programmes?	17%	22%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2 A prison job?	50%	38%
11.2 Vocational or skills training?	24%	49%
11.2 Education (including basic skills)?	13%	11%
11.2 Offending Behaviour Programmes?	29%	36%
11.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	49%	63%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
11.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	37%	50%
11.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	51%	44%
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:		
11.3 Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	38%	47%
11.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	54%	53%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
11.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	49%	55%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	42%	41%
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:		
11.3 Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	38%	42%
11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	13%	19%
11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	14%	19%
11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	31%	42%
11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	51%	48%
11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	51%	48%
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	8%	11%
SECTION 12: Friends and family		
12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	47%	60%
12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	26%	25%
12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	29%	30%
12.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	21%	43%

Catholic vs Protestant comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
For those who are sentenced:			
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	42%	55%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:			
13.2	No contact?	15%	27%
13.2	Contact by letter?	0%	0%
13.2	Contact by phone?	0%	0%
13.2	Contact by visit?	85%	73%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	23%	15%
For those who are sentenced:			
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	55%	38%
For those with a sentence plan:			
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	68%	37%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:			
13.6	Nobody?	8%	42%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	31%	15%
13.6	Offender manager?	61%	27%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	23%	27%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	23%	27%
For those with a sentence plan:			
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	71%	58%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	15%	17%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	61%	42%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	8%	9%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	15%	7%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:			
13.12	Employment?	26%	11%
13.12	Accommodation?	35%	33%
13.12	Benefits?	40%	22%
13.12	Finances?	22%	15%
13.12	Education?	34%	18%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	40%	20%
For those who are sentenced:			
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	48%	48%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability) Maghaberry Prison (main site) 2012

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 percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		67	104
1.3	Are you sentenced?	42%	45%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	6%	17%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	96%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	0%	8%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	2%
1.10	Are you Muslim?	0%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?		
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	10%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	21%	33%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	52%	57%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	64%	71%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	50%	66%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	52%	52%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	91%	77%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from healthcare when you first arrived here?	53%	70%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	50%	72%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	85%	77%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	50%	58%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	80%	88%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	92%	92%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	31%	47%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	16%	13%
4.6	Does the tuck shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	50%	66%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	51%	49%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	56%	56%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	65%	63%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	53%	61%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	55%	66%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the PREP scheme?	41%	42%
6.2	Do the different levels of the PREP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	41%	42%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	16%	14%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	76%	84%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	70%	68%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	20%	24%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	33%	37%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	66%	45%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	39%	12%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	56%	30%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	41%	13%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	6%	7%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	8%	9%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	6%	7%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	2%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	11%	0%

Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	46%	30%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	29%	12%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	2%	8%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	9%	8%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	5%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	2%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	8%	0%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	33%	33%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	56%	64%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	87%	54%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	82%	33%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	39%	38%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	42%	42%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	33%	40%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	11%	12%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	42%	32%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	19%	25%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	25%	44%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	41%	56%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	42%	50%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	7%	9%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	31%	26%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	34%	29%

Main comparator and comparator to last time



**Prisoner survey responses Maghaberry Prison (Mourne) 2012: Mourne v main site
Mourne 2012 v Mourne 2009**

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

Key to tables

		Mourne 2012	Main site	Mourne 2012	Mourne 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		119	179	119	30
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	0%	0%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	99%	43%	99%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	10%	3%	10%	3%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	11%	14%	11%	0%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (ICS/ECS prisoner)?	1%	1%	1%	0%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	14%	13%	14%	7%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	99%	97%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	97%	99%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	4%	5%	4%	0%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	3%	1%	3%	
1.10	Are you Muslim?	0%	0%	0%	0%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	1%	2%	1%	11%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	25%	39%	25%	11%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%	7%	6%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	42%	28%	42%	42%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	51%	61%	51%	37%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than two hours in the van?	24%	28%	24%	8%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	6%	22%	6%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	6%	7%	6%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	41%	50%	41%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	66%	63%	66%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	47%	55%	47%	48%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	58%	68%	58%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	4%	4%	4%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	53%	70%	53%	44%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		Mourne 2012	Main site	Mourne 2012	Mourne 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than two hours?	32%	43%	32%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	52%	59%	52%	45%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	37%	53%	37%	46%
When you first arrived:					
3.4	Did you have any problems?	70%	83%	70%	72%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	24%	12%	24%	28%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	11%	27%	11%	8%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	2%	2%	0%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	29%	30%	29%	28%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	4%	6%	4%	16%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	24%	33%	24%	16%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	20%	31%	20%	32%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	15%	23%	15%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	19%	34%	19%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	8%	14%	8%	8%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	24%	28%	24%	42%
For those with problems:					
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	27%	38%	27%	
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:					
3.6	Tobacco?	33%	38%	33%	36%
3.6	A shower?	65%	69%	65%	57%
3.6	A free telephone call?	44%	72%	44%	39%
3.6	Something to eat?	50%	61%	50%	50%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	37%	49%	37%	
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	48%	59%	48%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Mourne 2012	Main site	Mourne 2012	Mourne 2009
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued				
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7 The chaplain or a religious leader?	43%	57%	43%	
3.7 Someone from health services?	58%	64%	58%	
3.7 A Listener/Samaritans?	12%	24%	12%	
3.7 Tuck shop/canteen?	42%	51%	42%	38%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8 What was going to happen to you?	40%	42%	40%	41%
3.8 Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	20%	40%	20%	27%
3.8 How to make routine requests?	30%	38%	30%	44%
3.8 Your entitlement to visits?	36%	44%	36%	44%
3.8 Health services?	37%	46%	37%	37%
3.8 The chaplaincy?	29%	45%	29%	37%
3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?	56%	63%	56%	56%
3.10 Have you been on an induction course?	70%	80%	70%	62%
For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11 Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	41%	49%	41%	33%
3.12 Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	70%	61%	70%	
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody				
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1 Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	62%	55%	62%	79%
4.1 Attend legal visits?	47%	68%	47%	57%
4.1 Get bail information?	14%	32%	14%	16%
4.2 Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	70%	48%	70%	80%
4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?	28%	22%	28%	
For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4 Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	92%	85%	92%	93%
4.4 Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	99%	92%	99%	100%
4.4 Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	70%	83%	70%	67%
4.4 Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	84%	79%	84%	97%
4.4 Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	32%	41%	32%	18%
4.4 Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	78%	61%	78%	73%
4.4 Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	25%	26%	25%	41%
4.5 Is the food in this prison good/very good?	16%	15%	16%	45%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		Mourne 2012	Main site	Mourne 2012	Mourne 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	37%	60%	37%	32%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	50%	50%	50%	63%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	49%	56%	49%	63%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	70%	64%	70%	80%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	36%	42%	36%	
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	75%	57%	75%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	49%	47%	49%	50%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	70%	59%	70%	42%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	82%	62%	82%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	35%	43%	35%	27%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	67%	56%	67%	38%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	26%	28%	26%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	24%	12%	24%	41%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the PREP scheme?	58%	42%	58%	
6.2	Do the different levels of the PREP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	41%	43%	41%	
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	4%	15%	4%	
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation and separation unit, were you treated very well/well by staff?	21%	40%	21%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff in this prison treat you with respect?	79%	81%	79%	80%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	65%	68%	65%	77%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	30%	35%	30%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	27%	22%	27%	45%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	40%	37%	40%	41%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	60%	75%	60%	50%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Mourne 2012	Main site	Mourne 2012	Mourne 2009
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	54%	52%	54%	77%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	14%	22%	14%	7%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	40%	39%	40%	60%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	21%	22%	21%	50%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	12%	7%	12%	33%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	3%	4%	3%	3%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	21%	23%	21%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	4%	2%	4%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	10%	8%	10%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	5%	2%	5%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	7%	4%	7%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	8%	7%	8%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	11%	8%	11%	17%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	10%	7%	10%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	7%	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	1%	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	4%	4%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	4%	7%	14%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	15%	13%	15%	17%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	7%	7%	7%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Mourne 2012	Main site	Mourne 2012	Mourne 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	45%	36%	45%	41%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	26%	21%	26%	23%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	8%	8%	8%	8%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	5%	2%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	23%	18%	23%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	7%	8%	7%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	1%	2%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	5%	3%	5%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	5%	5%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	16%	8%	16%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	12%	7%	12%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	4%	5%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	3%	1%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	2%	8%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	16%	8%	16%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	4%	4%	
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	31%	47%	31%	52%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Mourne 2012	Main site	Mourne 2012	Mourne 2009
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	46%	33%	46%	21%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	65%	61%	65%	17%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	23%	16%	23%	47%
For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:					
9.2	The doctor?	51%	40%	51%	21%
9.2	The nurse?	60%	59%	60%	29%
9.2	The dentist?	57%	36%	57%	76%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	35%	43%	35%	25%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	69%	67%	69%	60%
For those currently taking medication:					
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	99%	91%	99%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	30%	51%	30%	7%
For those who have problems:					
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	55%	49%	55%	
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	26%	29%	26%	17%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	39%	33%	39%	57%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	48%	38%	48%	45%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	7%	10%	7%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	8%	9%	8%	4%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	11%	11%	11%	
For those with drug or alcohol problems:					
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	66%	46%	66%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	73%	45%	73%	
For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:					
10.9	Was the support helpful?	78%	78%	78%	100%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		Mourne 2012	Main site	Mourne 2012	Mourne 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 11: Activities					
	Is it very easy/easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1	A prison job?	44%	18%	44%	
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	42%	29%	42%	
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	53%	47%	53%	
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	41%	18%	41%	
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2	A prison job?	70%	43%	70%	90%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	20%	37%	20%	37%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	35%	12%	35%	60%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	28%	36%	28%	60%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	88%	59%	88%	
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	50%	46%	50%	
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	79%	52%	79%	
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	55%	44%	55%	
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	89%	59%	89%	
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	70%	59%	70%	
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	80%	44%	80%	
	For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	63%	39%	63%	
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	27%	22%	27%	4%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	25%	21%	25%	
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	46%	37%	46%	57%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	38%	50%	38%	63%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	84%	46%	84%	97%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	33%	8%	33%	71%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	33%	52%	33%	58%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	53%	28%	53%	60%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	13%	31%	13%	10%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	39%	26%	39%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		Mourne 2012	Main site	Mourne 2012	Mourne 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	59%	49%	59%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	17%	17%	17%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	9%	0%	9%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	3%	0%	3%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	77%	83%	77%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	45%	23%	45%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	63%	55%	63%	73%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	62%	64%	62%	68%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	15%	21%	15%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	20%	21%	20%	
13.6	Offender manager?	28%	39%	28%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	18%	25%	18%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	40%	29%	40%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	71%	67%	71%	100%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	3%	11%	3%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	26%	42%	26%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	8%	9%	8%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	16%	14%	16%	42%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:					
13.12	Employment?	21%	23%	21%	
13.12	Accommodation?	35%	35%	35%	
13.12	Benefits?	26%	29%	26%	
13.12	Finances?	16%	18%	16%	
13.12	Education?	22%	27%	22%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	37%	32%	37%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	56%	48%	56%	83%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (nationality) Maghaberry Prison (Mourne) 2012

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

Key to tables

		Foreign national prisoners	British national prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		16	102
1.3	Are you sentenced?	95%	99%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?		
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	80%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	90%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	30%	0%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	11%	1%
1.10	Are you Muslim?	0%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	37%	22%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	5%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	70%	37%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	37%	49%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	45%	60%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	55%	52%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	37%	38%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	94%	66%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	45%	61%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	37%	59%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	50%	74%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	47%	65%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Foreign national prisoners	British national prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	80%	94%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	99%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	20%	35%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	33%	14%
4.6	Does the tuck shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	30%	37%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	25%	54%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	25%	53%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	63%	72%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	55%	78%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	65%	84%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the PREP scheme?	50%	59%
6.2	Do the different levels of the PREP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	37%	41%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	5%	3%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	100%	76%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	78%	63%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	25%	27%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	39%	40%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	55%	54%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	11%	14%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	30%	41%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	11%	22%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	20%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	5%	12%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	20%	9%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	5%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Foreign national prisoners	British national prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	50%	44%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	5%	26%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	25%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	20%	15%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	30%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	37%	47%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	75%	63%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	63%	71%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	30%	30%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	47%	49%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	47%	73%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	21%	20%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	39%	34%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	26%	28%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	20%	28%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	61%	44%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	70%	33%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	90%	83%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	25%	34%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	45%	54%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	5%	14%



Prisoner survey responses Maghaberry Prison (Mourne) 2012: Protestant v Roman Catholic

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

Key to tables

		Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		38	38
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	98%	98%
1.3	Are you on recall?	4%	11%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	23%	2%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (ICS/ECS prisoner)?	2%	2%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	27%	0%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	4%	0%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	10%	0%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	23%	15%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	0%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	50%	26%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	54%	67%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than two hours in the van?	34%	24%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	7%	5%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	7%	5%
2.4	Was the van clean?	50%	30%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	68%	73%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	55%	51%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	54%	73%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	2%	4%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	51%	61%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners	
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse			
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details			
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference			
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than two hours?	26%	44%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	61%	51%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	43%	44%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	67%	52%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	23%	21%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	20%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	0%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	25%	17%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	5%	2%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	27%	17%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	14%	12%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	20%	12%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	20%	5%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	9%	0%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	27%	12%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	30%	30%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	32%	44%
3.6	A shower?	68%	75%
3.6	A free telephone call?	47%	59%
3.6	Something to eat?	50%	59%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	36%	52%
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	55%	52%
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	50%	56%
3.7	Someone from health services?	68%	52%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	15%	10%
3.7	Prison tuck shop/ canteen?	47%	56%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued		
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8 What was going to happen to you?	40%	45%
3.8 Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	14%	27%
3.8 How to make routine requests?	32%	43%
3.8 Your entitlement to visits?	32%	58%
3.8 Health services?	42%	45%
3.8 The chaplaincy?	35%	34%
3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?	62%	67%
3.10 Have you been on an induction course?	67%	85%
For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11 Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	47%	45%
3.12 Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	75%	75%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody		
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1 Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	63%	74%
4.1 Attend legal visits?	44%	55%
4.1 Get bail information?	11%	26%
4.2 Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	65%	70%
4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?	30%	27%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4 Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	86%	91%
4.4 Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	100%
4.4 Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	69%	61%
4.4 Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	86%	84%
4.4 Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	35%	36%
4.4 Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	86%	75%
4.4 Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	31%	26%
4.5 Is the food in this prison good/very good?	30%	13%
4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	54%	25%
4.7 Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	51%	52%
4.8 Are your religious beliefs respected?	52%	61%
4.9 Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	77%	84%
4.10 Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	50%	32%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints		
5.1 Is it easy to make an application?	76%	79%
For those who have made an application:		
5.2 Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	74%	43%
5.2 Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	76%	74%
5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?	82%	88%
For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4 Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	38%	37%
5.4 Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	77%	60%
5.5 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	24%	21%
5.6 Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	16%	38%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme		
6.1 Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the PREP scheme?	56%	67%
6.2 Do the different levels of the PREP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	50%	42%
6.3 In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	2%	9%
6.4 In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation and separation unit, were you treated very well/well by staff?	0%	33%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff		
7.1 Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	77%	73%
7.2 Is there a member of staff in this prison that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	71%	68%
7.3 Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	33%	25%
7.4 Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	24%	31%
7.5 Do you have a personal officer?	32%	54%
For those with a personal officer:		
7.6 Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	85%	47%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	61%	28%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	23%	0%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	31%	24%
Since you have been here, have other prisoners:			
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	23%	2%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	14%	0%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	5%	0%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	23%	0%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	5%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	14%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	5%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	11%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	14%	10%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	11%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	9%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	9%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	9%	2%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	47%	35%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	28%	16%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	21%	0%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	26%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	9%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	26%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	23%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	12%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	9%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	12%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	9%	0%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	43%	31%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	39%	52%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	65%	54%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	14%	16%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:		
9.2	The doctor?	50%	50%
9.2	The nurse?	75%	48%
9.2	The dentist?	52%	56%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	38%	35%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	73%	68%
	For those currently taking medication:		
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	97%	100%
9.6	Do you have any emotional wellbeing or mental health problems?	41%	21%
	For those who have problems:		
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	67%	25%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	31%	14%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	44%	23%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	47%	42%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	5%	9%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	9%	9%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	11%	14%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	67%	44%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	69%	56%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
10.9	Was the support helpful?	92%	50%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 11: Activities		
Is it very easy/easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1 A prison job?	35%	35%
11.1 Vocational or skills training?	31%	37%
11.1 Education (including basic skills)?	46%	46%
11.1 Offending Behaviour Programmes?	36%	35%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2 A prison job?	60%	70%
11.2 Vocational or skills training?	14%	22%
11.2 Education (including basic skills)?	33%	24%
11.2 Offending Behaviour Programmes?	29%	15%
11.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	73%	90%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
11.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	47%	54%
11.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	63%	82%
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:		
11.3 Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	63%	48%
11.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	68%	94%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
11.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	71%	67%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	59%	83%
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:		
11.3 Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	70%	56%
11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	26%	21%
11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	24%	12%
11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	56%	42%
11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	61%	26%
11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	91%	84%
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	26%	40%
SECTION 12: Friends and family		
12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	41%	32%
12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	42%	63%
12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	9%	14%
12.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	42%	47%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Roman Catholic prisoners	Protestant prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	50%	64%
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:		
13.2	No contact?	11%	23%
13.2	Contact by letter?	6%	18%
13.2	Contact by phone?	0%	5%
13.2	Contact by visit?	79%	68%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	37%	50%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	58%	53%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	56%	68%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:		
13.6	Nobody?	22%	9%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	17%	23%
13.6	Offender manager?	9%	39%
13.6	Named/personal officer?	9%	18%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	38%	39%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	80%	70%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	0%	11%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	29%	29%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	5%	10%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	5%	24%
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:		
13.12	Employment?	23%	23%
13.12	Accommodation?	36%	36%
13.12	Benefits?	25%	38%
13.12	Finances?	14%	21%
13.12	Education?	21%	21%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	30%	44%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	61%	40%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability and age over 50) Maghaberry Prison (Mourne) 2012

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

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		29	90	23	96
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	98%	100%	98%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	20%	11%	9%	15%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	94%	99%	100%	97%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	94%	100%	100%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	6%	4%	0%	5%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	3%	2%	0%	4%
1.10	Are you Muslim?	0%	0%	0%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			39%	21%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	6%	4%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	42%	42%	31%	45%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	57%	44%	61%	44%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	60%	57%	52%	59%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	55%	51%	44%	53%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	36%	38%	41%	37%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	94%	63%	78%	69%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	59%	57%	56%	58%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	55%	56%	48%	58%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	74%	69%	69%	71%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	53%	64%	62%	62%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4 Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	97%	91%	100%	90%
4.4 Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	99%	100%	99%
4.4 Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	31%	32%	38%	31%
4.5 Is the food in this prison good/very good?	18%	16%	19%	16%
4.6 Does the tuck shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	36%	36%	42%	36%
4.7 Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	36%	54%	54%	49%
4.8 Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	46%	62%	46%
4.9 Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	67%	71%	75%	70%
5.1 Is it easy to make an application?	70%	77%	84%	73%
5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?	75%	83%	85%	80%
6.1 Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the PREP scheme?	63%	56%	59%	57%
6.2 Do the different levels of the PREP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	41%	41%	41%	41%
6.3 In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	5%	4%	4%
7.1 Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	94%	75%	85%	77%
7.2 Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	79%	60%	56%	68%
7.3 Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	40%	22%	44%	23%
7.4 Do you have a personal officer?	40%	41%	41%	40%
8.1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?	69%	49%	41%	57%
8.2 Do you feel unsafe now?	15%	15%	8%	15%
8.3 Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	49%	37%	50%	38%
8.5 Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	20%	21%	7%	24%
8.5 Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	11%	7%	4%	9%
8.5 Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	6%	12%	7%	11%
8.5 Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	14%	9%	4%	11%
8.5 Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.5 Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	14%	1%	19%	1%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	43%	47%	41%	46%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	18%	25%	22%	24%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	6%	5%	4%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	14%	16%	19%	15%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	21%	9%	7%	13%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	3%	0%	0%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	44%	46%	44%	46%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	82%	60%	74%	63%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	89%	62%	74%	69%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	56%	21%	37%	29%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	57%	46%	44%	49%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	16%	22%	75%	69%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	72%	69%	16%	21%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	13%	22%	29%	36%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	34%	25%	25%	28%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	18%	30%	19%	29%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	32%	51%	26%	51%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	42%	37%	41%	38%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	97%	79%	78%	85%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	47%	28%	44%	30%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	49%	54%	50%	54%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	6%	15%	15%	13%



Copyright© Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland
All rights reserved

First published in Northern Ireland in December 2012 by
CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSPECTION NORTHERN IRELAND
14 Great Victoria Street
Belfast BT2 7BA
www.cjini.org

ISBN 978-1-905283-81-1

Typeset in Gill Sans
Printed in Northern Ireland by GPS Colour Graphics Limited
Designed by Page Setup