



REPORT ON AN UNANNOUNCED INSPECTION OF MAGILLIGAN PRISON

27 MAY - 5 JUNE 2014

February 2015





REPORT ON AN UNANNOUNCED INSPECTION OF MAGILLIGAN PRISON 27 MAY - 5 JUNE 2014

by the Chief Inspector of Criminal Justice in Northern Ireland; Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons; the Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority and the 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.

February 2015





Contents

List of abbreviations	4
Chief Inspectors' Foreword	5
Fact page	8
About this inspection and report	9
Healthy Prison Summary	12
Inspection Report	
Chapter 1: Safety	20
Chapter 2: Respect	31
Chapter 3: Purposeful activity	46
Chapter 4: Resettlement	52
Chapter 5: Summary of recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice	60



List of abbreviations

AD:EPT	Alcohol and Drugs: Empowering People Through Therapy (addiction programme)
CJI	Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland
CJO	Criminal Justice Order 2009
CSRA	Cell Sharing Risk Assessment
CSU	Care and Separation Unit
DHSSPS	Department of Health Social Services and Public Safety
DoJ	Department of Justice
EMIS	Egton Medical Information System (medical computer system)
ETI	Education and Training Inspectorate
GP	General Practitioner
HMIP	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (in England and Wales)
IEP	Incentives and Earned Privileges Scheme
MDT	Mandatory Drug Test
NIPS	Northern Ireland Prison Service
NPM	National Preventive Mechanism
OPCAT	Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture
PECCS	Prisoner Escorting and Court Custody Services
PPANI	Public Protection Arrangements Northern Ireland
PREPS	Progressive Regime and Earned Privileges Scheme
PRISM	Prisoner Record Information System Management (computer system used by NIPS)
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

Magilligan Prison is a medium security prison with a semi-open annex, 'Foyleview'. It holds 571 adult men from across Northern Ireland serving sentences ranging between less than one year to life, most of whom have been transferred from Maghaberry Prison and are being prepared for release. This unannounced inspection was led by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons in England and Wales on behalf of, and with the support of Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland, and with the support of the Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority and the Education and Training Inspectorate.

Our last inspection in March/April 2010 found the prison was performing reasonably well against all our healthy prison tests and was the strongest performing of all the Northern Ireland prisons. Magilligan still has significant strengths that compare favourably with other prisons in Northern Ireland - but this inspection found that the prison had slipped back in some important areas and action was now required to prevent a further decline.

For most prisoners Magilligan was reasonably safe. Relationships between staff and prisoners were much better than we normally see in Northern Ireland, and these underpinned good

dynamic security. Reception and first night procedures were good, the number of violent and self-harm incidents were low and there had been no self-inflicted deaths in the prison for many years. There was 'free-flow' movement around the prison without causing difficulty. Support for those with a substance abuse problem was good.

However, there was a degree of complacency about safety which was not underpinned by solid processes that focused on outcomes for prisoners. In addition, the prison culture was risk averse and this sometimes manifested itself in an unwillingness to challenge poor behaviour.



Vulnerable prisoners felt much less safe than the population as a whole, and a lack of CCTV coverage on the house blocks created insecurity. Levels of drug use were high and there were no disciplinary consequences for a positive test result. The prison had tried to tackle trading in prescribed medicines by introducing 'supervised swallow', but we were told prisoners frequently went to the washrooms to regurgitate the drug for onward sale when they returned to the units and this was not challenged by staff. We did not find evidence that this led to large scale violence and bullying – it may be that supply was so easy that it was not a source of conflict – although some prisoners told us they or their families had been subject to intimidation in relation to drugs.

The prison's strategy for reducing violence was poor and insufficiently informed by analysis of data. Links with drug reduction and security strategies were weak. The regime was too often curtailed by 'suspensions' in movement around the prison to manage incidents which were isolated on wings and did not require a wider response. Use of segregation was high although stays were short; governance of this was poor and we saw little evidence of any efforts to address the behaviour of the prisoners concerned. In practice this meant prisoners spending a few days lying on their bunks, in dirty cells, with nothing to do – and with no discernible effect. Use of force was low but we were also concerned that governance of this was weak and there was insufficient assurance that its use was always necessary and proportionate.

Measures to prevent self-harm were not proportionate to risk and focused on the

procedure rather than the prisoner. Humiliating anti-ligature clothing that consisted of baggy green tear-proof shorts and a top was used frequently.

The older 'H-Block' accommodation which had no in-cell sanitation was very poor and needed to be replaced but the newer accommodation was much better. For most prisoners, good standards of cleanliness, a decent although rather bleak external environment, good time out of cell, combined with good relationships between staff and prisoners mitigated many of the weaknesses in the prison. Catholic prisoners reported more negatively than Protestant prisoners and there was some evidence to reflect worse outcomes. The prison needed to do more to understand and address this. Support for other prisoners whose needs were different from the majority also needed to be improved. Health services were good.

Although prisoners had plenty of time out of the cells, there was insufficient constructive activity and little incentive for them to take advantage of the opportunities that were available. Quantity and quality of activities were very poor. Forty per cent of prisoners were unemployed, much of the work that did exist was mundane and the range of training and education was limited, unrelated to the labour market, and offered only low level qualifications. Prisoners who were working hard in some of the better workshops complained, with justification, that because the wage structure was heavily linked to the behaviour management scheme, a well behaved prisoner received practically the same 'wage' whether they worked or not. Prisoners at Magilligan

were poorly prepared for work after they left the prison.

In sharp contrast, real progress had been made in resettlement with some excellent and joined-up offender management driven by both the prison and probation staff. Good use was made of home leave to support re-integration and family contacts, and some decent practical resettlement support was offered. Children and families, work and the range of interventions available were particularly strong. More focus was needed to realise the potential of the semi-open Foyleview unit which, in conjunction with a linked unit in Belfast, had the potential to be a very important and innovative resettlement resource. However,

that potential was not yet realised. Progress in this area should provide managers with a template of what could be achieved in improving purposeful activity, given sufficient attention and resources.

Overall, this is a much more mixed picture than the last inspection. It is important that the strengths of the prison – very good relationships, reasonable levels of safety and good resettlement work – are not undermined by a risk averse culture, insufficient purposeful activity and an unwillingness to challenge poor behaviour. The prison's work on resettlement shows what can be done and provides a standard to which the prison as a whole should aspire.



Brendan McGuigan
Chief Inspector of Criminal Justice
in Northern Ireland

February 2015



Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons
in England and Wales

February 2015



Fact page

Task of the establishment

Medium security prison holding sentenced prisoners usually received on transfer from Maghaberry Prison. The aim of Magilligan is to provide safe, secure and decent custody with a focus on pre-release preparation, risk management and resettlement.

Prison status (public or private, with name of contractor if private)

Public.

Region/Department

Department of Justice, Northern Ireland (DoJ).

Number held

560.

Certified normal accommodation

571.

Operational capacity

598.

Date of last inspection

March 2010.

Brief history

The prison opened in May 1971 as a 'compound prison' and in May 1972 became Magilligan Prison. The original Nissen huts and compound accommodation were replaced in the early 1980s. In 1994 Foyleview was commissioned as a semi-open facility. Sperrin, a 64-bed unit with dormitory accommodation, was recommissioned in 2005. Alpha, a 50-cell unit, was opened in 2008 and Halward House, a 60-cell unit, opened in 2009.

Short description of residential units

House 1	Induction unit and non-vulnerable prisoners. Up to 100 prisoners.
House 2	Older and non-vulnerable prisoners. Up to 100 prisoners.
House 3	Vulnerable and non-vulnerable prisoners. Up to 100 prisoners.
Halward House	Drug free and vulnerable prisoners and harm reduction unit. Up to 60 prisoners.
Sperrin unit	Vulnerable prisoner unit. Up to 64 prisoners.
Alpha unit	Assessment centre for vulnerable and non-vulnerable prisoners transferring to Foyleview resettlement unit, up to 50 prisoners.
Foyleview	Resettlement unit for vulnerable and non-vulnerable prisoners. Up to 80 prisoners.

Name of governor

Stephen Davis.

Escort contractor

In-house service: PECCS (Prisoner Escorting and Court Custody Services).

Health service commissioner and providers

South Eastern Health and Social Care Trust (SEHSCT).

Learning and skills providers

A mixed community of in-house providers and teachers from the North West Regional College who are engaged to provide essential skills training.

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Tom Kerrigan.

About this inspection and report

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (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. Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland (CJI) is an independent statutory inspectorate, established under the Justice (Northern Ireland) Act 2002, constituted as a non-departmental public body in the person of the Chief Inspector. CJI was established in accordance with Recommendation 263 of the Review of the Criminal Justice System in Northern Ireland of March, 2000.

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

The Education and Training Inspectorate (ETI) is a unitary inspectorate, and provides independent inspection services and information about the quality of education, youth provision and training in Northern Ireland. It also provides inspection services for the CJI, of the learning and skills provision within prisons, in line with an agreed annual Memorandum of Understanding and an associated Service Level Agreement.

The Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority (RQIA) is a non-departmental public body responsible for monitoring and inspecting the quality, safety and availability of health and social care services across Northern Ireland. It also has the responsibility of encouraging improvements in those services. The functions of the RQIA are derived from The Health and Personal Social Services (Quality, Improvement and Regulation) (Northern Ireland) Order 2003.

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

Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. There are four possible judgements: in some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the Northern Ireland Prison Service (NIPS).



The assessments are as follows:

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

Our assessments might result in one of the following:

- **Recommendations:** will require significant change and/or new or re-directed resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be reviewed for implementation at future inspections.
- **Housekeeping points:** achievable within a matter of days, or at most weeks, through the issue of instructions or changing routines.
- **Examples of good practice:** impressive practice that not only meets or exceeds our expectations, but could be followed by other similar establishments to achieve positive outcomes for prisoners.

Five key sources of evidence are used by Inspectors: observation; prisoner surveys; discussions with prisoners; discussions with staff and relevant third parties; and documentation. During inspections we use a mixed-method approach to data gathering and analysis, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Evidence from different sources is triangulated to strengthen the validity of our assessments.

This is the first full unannounced prison inspection carried out in Northern Ireland. Previously, all inspections in Northern Ireland were announced and either full (a new inspection of the establishment), full follow-ups (a new inspection of the establishment with an assessment of whether recommendations at the previous inspection had been achieved and investigation of any areas of serious concern previously identified) or short follow-ups (where there were comparatively fewer concerns and establishments were assessed as making either sufficient or insufficient progress against the previous recommendations). This inspection follows a short follow-up inspection and does not report directly on progress made against the previous recommendations.

This report

This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four chapters each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations: Criteria for assessing the treatment of prisoners and conditions in prisons*. Chapter 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection.

Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices 1 and 2 respectively. This material can be obtained directly from the CJI website - **www.cjini.org**.

Findings from the survey of prisoners and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix 3 of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.¹ Again, this material can be obtained directly from the CJI website - **www.cjini.org**.

¹ 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.



Healthy Prison Summary

Safety

- S1 Prisoners reported negatively about escorts. Reception, first night and induction procedures were reasonable, but many vulnerable prisoners reported feeling unsafe on their first night. Safety procedures were not robust but most prisoners told us they were safe and the number of violent incidents was low. Levels of self-harm were low. More attention to individual care was needed and the approach was too risk averse. Adult safeguarding arrangements were under-developed. Security had improved but it was not well integrated with other key prison functions. Not enough was done to reduce the high availability of drugs and diverted medicines. The Progressive Regime and Earned Privileges Scheme (PREPS) was reasonably well managed. The environment and relationships in segregation were decent but the use of segregation was high and the regime was poor. Use of force was low but governance of segregation and use of force was poor. The management of adjudications was very good. Substance misuse support was reasonable overall. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.**
- S2 Prisoners were given little time to prepare for transfer to Magilligan and reported negatively about their escort experience. Vulnerable prisoners were often subject to verbal abuse from other prisoners during escorts and only 39% said they felt safe on their first night. The reception area was clean and bright and prisoners were well treated by staff, but the initial interviews did not take place in private. Conditions on the first night centre were good and the cells were clean and properly prepared. Induction consisted of individual and group contributions and prisoners expressed mixed views about its usefulness.
- S3 There was little evidence that the illicit use of drugs and prescribed medication resulted in frequent fights or assaults and most prisoners said they felt safe. Drug related intimidation was a problem for a few prisoners and their families. In our survey, vulnerable prisoners had poorer perceptions of safety and victimisation than others. The strategic approach to bullying and violence reduction was weak. There was no comprehensive collation or analysis of indicators on bullying and links between safer custody, security and work to reduce the supply of drugs were under-developed. Procedures to keep declared 'enemies' apart were not sufficiently robust, transparent or evidence based. The 'Safer at Magilligan' procedure was little used and most incidents were referred to security. The procedure did not form part of a wider safer custody strategy and few staff had been trained to use it. Most investigations were poor.
- S4 There had been no self-inflicted deaths in recent years and incidents of self-harm were low. Too much focus was given to completing the requirements of Supporting Prisoners At Risk (SPAR) procedures rather than identifying underlying concerns and finding alternative responses to the frequent use of observation cells and anti-ligature clothing. Most SPARs were opened for only a short time. The record of SPAR reviews needed improvement. A range of interventions was available to support prisoners at risk, including a well supported team of Listeners (prisoners trained to support those at risk of self-harm).

- S5 Adult safeguarding arrangements were not operating in the prison and a more integrated approach to safeguarding was required.
- S6 Dynamic security had improved since the last inspection. The flow of information was well managed and staff responded quickly to immediate security issues. Free flow movement was well managed and staff supervision of prisoners on residential units was effective. However, alarm bells inappropriately led to the whole prison regime being suspended and there remained shortfalls in the strategic approach to managing security. Levels of drug availability and use were high and more needed to be done to manage the problem. Mandatory drug testing provided little deterrent.
- S7 The PREPS was well managed and applied consistently across the prison. The small number of prisoners on basic level were managed through individual care plans. They experienced a reasonable regime.
- S8 Records of adjudication hearings showed that proceedings were conducted fairly and hearings that we observed were conducted very well. The audio recording of all hearings was good practice. Living conditions in the segregation unit were good. Relationships between staff and prisoners were good but the regime for longer-stay prisoners was poor and re-integration planning was weak. Although the average length of stay was reasonably short, use of the segregation unit was very high. Governance was poor and it was not clear that segregation was always justified. The number of reported incidents of the use of force was low. However, governance was again poor and the Use of Force Committee was under-developed. The completion of documentation was poor and important information was frequently missing.
- S9 Clinical substance misuse services were poorly integrated with psychosocial services. Psychosocial interventions were appropriate and comprehensive, but waiting lists were too long. There was no specialised drug treatment accommodation and use of the segregation unit for detoxification was inappropriate.

Respect

- S10 Some accommodation was unacceptable but some newer units were of a good standard. Cleanliness was good and prisoners were positive about support available for daily living. Relationships between staff and prisoners were generally good and much better than we have seen elsewhere in Northern Ireland. Monitoring had consistently shown poorer outcomes for Catholics in some areas and more needed to be done to understand this. Despite some under-developed procedures, prisoners with obvious diversity issues were supported. Complaints were well managed and reasonable legal services were provided. Health services were good overall. Prisoners were positive about the food and the shop provided a good service, although there could be delays with the first order. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.**



- S11 The general environment of the prison was marred by oppressive fences and razor wire. The three house-blocks were still mostly unfit for purpose and dormitories remained cramped and oppressive. Halward and Alpha provided good standard accommodation. Despite this, prisoners were positive about the domestic arrangements. Cleanliness was generally good throughout the residential units, although the offensive displays policy was not adhered to on some wings.
- S12 Our surveys showed that prisoners were very positive about relationships with staff and our observations confirmed this. We noted many very good interactions between staff and prisoners, although there were some complaints about the behaviour and attitude of a few staff. The overwhelming majority of officers addressed prisoners by their first name and the positive staff culture provided opportunities to build on some areas of weakness.
- S13 Considerable efforts had been made to improve the management of diversity since the previous inspection. A large quantity of statistical information was being gathered and the equality and diversity meeting was beginning to function more effectively. Prisoner representatives had become involved in the process. Despite these changes, it was not clear that these arrangements were operating effectively and there was an ethos that all prisoners should be treated the same, rather than according to their needs. Data showed that Catholics were disproportionately represented in relation to disciplinary procedures and PREPS. Although these discrepancies were identified, they were not always investigated robustly to determine the underlying causes. In our survey, 41% of Catholic prisoners compared to 27% of Protestant prisoners said they had been victimised by a member of staff. Despite these poor perceptions, during the inspection we received few complaints from prisoners that they were discriminated against because of their religion.
- S14 The Equality and Diversity Co-ordinator provided some good individual support for prisoners from minority groups, but there was no strategic or systematic approach to this. We received positive feedback from some foreign national prisoners about the help they had received. However, foreign nationals were not all interviewed on committal and there was no guaranteed way of ensuring their needs were met. Some older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities benefited from living in recently refurbished accommodation, but there was not enough to meet the needs of all of them. Most of the additional support these prisoners received was provided informally by other prisoners. There was very little promotion or celebration of diversity throughout the prison and little attention was given to matters relating to prisoners' sexuality.
- S15 Prisoners' religious and pastoral needs continued to be well met. Feedback from our group discussions and survey results were positive. There was still no dedicated space to worship and the facilities were poor.
- S16 Complaints were recorded and tracked efficiently and most were answered within the required timescales. Most replies were respectful and management oversight was good. Procedures for progressing complaints beyond the Prison Service were well publicised.
- S17 Prisoners in our survey were generally positive about access to solicitors and legal visits. The selection of legal materials in the library was inadequate.

- S18 A Health Care Strategic Management Forum was in place but attendance needed to improve. Local governance meetings were more informal and were working well. A health care needs assessment report had been finalised. Effective information-sharing protocols were being developed and a range of health promotion information and support was available. Progress in the delivery of some health care services, including implementation and monitoring of chronic disease management clinics, had been hampered by staff shortages. Access to health care services was good and waiting lists were reasonable. The fabric of the health care facilities was satisfactory, but some health care rooms needed attention. Resuscitation equipment was disorganised and out of date and weekly checks were not always carried out.
- S19 Some elements of the stock management and dispensing of medications needed improvement and there was potential in the health care centre for prisoners to have unauthorised access to medications. Nevertheless, significant work had been undertaken to reduce the number of divertible medications held in possession with the introduction of supervised swallow (the supervision of prisoners taking medication to ensure that it has been swallowed). Although necessary, this was time consuming and affected some clinical outcomes negatively. The Health Trust needed to review how this was organised to ensure the effective use of nursing time. General Practitioners (GPs) were starting to standardise prescribing practice.
- S20 Dental services were good and waiting lists were short. Mental health services had improved since the last inspection but the services offered by the Forensic Occupational Therapist had been reduced. More group work was required for prisoners with lower level mental health concerns.
- S21 We found the standard of food to be generally good. On the whole, cultural needs were catered for and fresh vegetables and fruit were available every day. Meals were served at reasonable times. The tuck shop list broadly met the needs of prisoners and new arrivals could buy a reception pack, but they could wait too long for their first shop order.

Purposeful activity

S22 Time out of cell was good, free flow was well managed and prisoners had good access to outside areas. Leadership and management of learning and skills needed urgent attention. There were too few activity places and over 40% of the population was unemployed. The range and breadth of opportunities offered was too narrow and too few activities offered appropriate accreditation. Some work offered was too mundane. The quality of teaching for the limited numbers in activities was good and the atmosphere constructive. Achievements were at much too low a level. The library and gym provided reasonable opportunities on the main site but not for those at Foyleview. **Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.**

- S23 There was reasonable time out of cell and most prisoners had about 9.4 hours a day. Frequent disruptions to the regime could reduce this. Free flow worked well for all prisoners, who had very good access to outside areas of the prison.



- S24 Since the previous inspection, there had been few discernible improvements in the provision of learning and skills and work activities and some aspects had regressed. Strategic leadership and management had been adversely affected by staff changes and budget reductions. The use of data to drive up standards needed to improve. Activity provision was not supported well enough across the prison. The education curriculum had narrowed and largely comprised the essential skills of literacy, numeracy and ICT, which were effectively delivered. The curriculum did not meet the needs of prisoners nor did it provide appropriate progression opportunities; only a few programmes were offered at level 2 or higher. There were not enough activities and over 40% of prisoners did not participate in education, vocational training or work. Too many wing-based jobs were mundane. The wage structure did not provide any incentives.
- S25 The quality of teaching, training and learning that we observed was good and relationships were strong. The initial assessment of prisoners' levels of attainment was systematic and the information was used well by tutors to inform classroom practice. While achievements to level 1 were good, too few prisoners progressed to higher level qualifications or applied their skills in meaningful contexts.
- S26 The curriculum for vocational training did not match the needs of the labour market. Prisoners engaged well and acquired a positive work ethic, and retention was good. Very little vocational training in Foyleview was accredited which did not enhance prisoners' employability.
- S27 The main library was well maintained and valued by most prisoners. There was a need for more materials to support vocational training and essential skills provision in education. Prisoners had good access to the library during the week but not at weekends.
- S28 Physical education was promoted well across the prison and valued by those who participated. The lack of a suitable all-weather outdoor surface continued to constrain the range of activities offered. A coherent, whole-prison approach to increasing physical education participation had yet to be developed. Library access and the gym for prisoners in Foyleview needed improvement.

Resettlement

S29 Offender management and support in the resettlement pathways were generally strong. Good use was made of home leave, although recording of decision making needed to be clearer. Public protection arrangements were mainly robust. There was a good process to assess need on arrival and most prisoners had a sentence plan which was regularly reviewed. Support for prisoners to maintain contact with family and friends was very good. The potential of Foyleview had yet to be fulfilled. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.**

- S30 There were still some gaps in the strategic approach to resettlement. However, there was well managed access to a broad range of resettlement opportunities. The co-location of sentence managers, case managers and community services promoted effective partnership work. Home

leave was used extensively to support resettlement planning. Frequent litigation by prisoners had the potential to undermine good decision making. Records of decisions were not detailed enough to show that all risks had been suitably considered.

- S31 Risk of harm and of re-offending was assessed by trained probation officers and used to inform sentence plans, which were reviewed every six months. Contact between prisoners and sentence/case managers was planned and regular, especially for prisoners on CJO (Criminal Justice Order 2009) sentences. Referrals to Public Protection Arrangements Northern Ireland (PPANI) were made promptly before release, and prisoners were released on temporary licence when appropriate. The prison hosted regular panel meetings. Some staff lacked awareness of public protection risks. Prisoners posing a risk of serious harm were subject to six-monthly risk management meetings, which were well attended.
- S32 In our survey, prisoners reported positively on the resettlement support they received. Needs assessment and referral processes were effective, and most prisoners received comprehensive release planning. There was good access to advice on housing, and this service was well used. Access to stable accommodation was a key factor in reducing re-offending and more needed to be done to monitor the effectiveness of this advice.
- S33 NIACRO provided good access to Job Track, an accredited pre-release course and a range of useful pre-and post-release support, including links to employers and new business start-ups. Prisoners needed better access to good quality careers advice. Foyleview had the potential to provide a link from prison to release but its role needed to be clarified and it needed to be more effective in preparing prisoners for the labour market. Few prisoners achieved accredited qualifications and, while some had community or paid work, these opportunities were under-developed.
- S34 There was no formal resettlement health pathway but there were good links with community health services which provided basic referral services to GPs. Substance misuse services pre-release were well developed. Finance, benefit and debt advice was good and work was in progress to identify a bank prepared to open accounts for prisoners.
- S35 A visitors' centre provided a pleasant welcome. Entry procedures were managed in a friendly and efficient manner, but we were told of delays on busy days. Vulnerable prisoners told us that their families could be intimidated. The visits facility was reasonably good. Attempts had been made to soften the institutional feel of the room. A supervised crèche area and a refreshments trolley were valued by visitors. Child-centred visits and the Family Officer post were excellent initiatives, but staff shortages adversely affected both. Barnardo's provided a range of parenting courses and one-to-one interventions to help prisoners develop parenting skills and maintain good relationships with their families.
- S36 The prison provided a comprehensive and appropriate range of accredited and non-accredited programmes.



Main concerns and recommendations

S37 Concern: The prison lacked a strategic approach to violence reduction and bullying. Violence reduction, security and drug strategies were not fully integrated and some anti-bullying processes were under-developed.

Recommendation: An effective Violence Reduction Strategy, incorporating anti-bullying procedures specific to Magilligan, should be implemented in consultation with prisoners.

S38 Concern: Governance and oversight of segregation and use of force was weak. Use of segregation was high and managers could not satisfy themselves that it was always proportionate. While use of force was low, the systems in place did not provide reassurance that it was always necessary and proportionate.

Recommendation: The governance of segregation and use of force should be sufficient to ensure that their use is appropriate and proportionate.

S39 Concern: The house blocks had no internal sanitation and access to toilets at night was dependent on sufficient staff being available to facilitate cells being unlocked. There were delays in the process which meant prisoners could not access toilets in a timely way, and were forced to use the buckets provided. The general environment was tired, despite some refurbishment taking place and the long corridors were difficult to supervise and claustrophobic.

Recommendation: House blocks should be replaced with more suitable, safe accommodation with appropriate sanitation arrangements, and covered walkways should be installed across the site.

S40 Concern: There were not enough activity places for the population, and many that were available were mundane and did not adequately equip prisoners for the external labour market. Participation levels were not good enough. The pay structure provided little incentive to work.

Recommendation: The participation rates in education, training and work should be increased, and a broader range of more challenging work activities should be provided to meet the needs of all prisoners. The pay structure should provide greater incentives to engage in purposeful activity.

S41 Concern: Foyleview had the potential to be a valuable resource in assisting prisoners reaching the end of their sentence to prepare for release into the community. This was particularly the case for those who had served long custodial sentences, including lifers. The role of the unit was not clear, nor was its relationship to the newly re-opened Burren House in Belfast. Men who were in the unit did not have full access to a range of training and work opportunities to prepare them adequately for this transition.

Recommendation: The Northern Ireland wide role of Foyleview in preparing prisoners for resettlement into the community, including those coming towards the end of long sentences, should be clarified and better coordinated.



Inspection Report



Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Prisoners were critical of their experiences of travelling to the prison. Vulnerable prisoners were often subject to verbal abuse by other prisoners, which was unacceptable.
- 1.2 Most prisoners arrived at Magilligan from Maghaberry. Prisoners in our groups said they were given little time to prepare for transfer and many described having visits already booked at the sending establishment.
- 1.3 The journey from Maghaberry to Magilligan Prison typically took about two hours. Prisoners reported more negatively than at comparator prisons about their experience of escorts across a range of indicators, including comfort, treatment and respect.
- 1.4 The routine use of handcuffs on all prisoners travelling to and from the prison had ceased. Handcuffs were now only used when prisoners arrived from, or left for, a non-secure location.
- 1.5 Prisoners and staff told us that vulnerable prisoners were often subject to verbal abuse from other prisoners on the vehicle. Staff we spoke to did not believe this was inappropriate or that it should be challenged.

Recommendations

- 1.6 **Prisoners should be given sufficient notice of transfers.**
- 1.7 **Prisoners being transported to the prison should be well treated.**
- 1.8 **Vulnerable prisoners should not be subject to verbal abuse by other prisoners when they are being transported to the prison.**

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 Prisoners were dealt with promptly and efficiently during their arrival and first days in the prison, and they were well treated. Improvements had been made to the risk assessment process. The standard induction programme served its purpose.
- 1.10 Reception was clean and brightly decorated. Prisoners were given something to eat and drink by an orderly as soon as they arrived and said that they were treated well by staff. Vulnerable prisoners were held in different holding rooms and dealt with separately.
- 1.11 The initial reception interview was undertaken across a counter in a shared space and did not afford privacy. Reception staff carried out a brief assessment of new arrivals to identify any immediate practical needs and information about potential risks was passed to the relevant department.
- 1.12 Although there was a facility for adding telephone credit, in our survey only 25% of prisoners said they were given a free telephone call on admission against the comparator of 42%.
- 1.13 Prisoners did not remain in reception for long and they were taken in small groups to the health care centre where they were interviewed by a nurse. They then moved to the first night centre on Halward House. Accommodation on the first night centre was suitable and cells were well equipped, clean and properly prepared.
- 1.14 All new prisoners occupied shared cells. Previously, cell-sharing risk assessments (CSRAs) had been completed by the sending establishment. The procedure had been improved recently and CSRAs were now updated by Magilligan staff, using more up-to-date information to make informed judgements about where prisoners should be located. Staff we spoke to at the first night centre were not yet familiar with these changes.
- 1.15 Prisoners were issued with a booklet of information about regimes and services, some of which was out of date.
- 1.16 Induction started as soon as prisoners arrived at the first night centre. An Induction Officer spent 20 minutes with each prisoner going through the information booklet. The five-day induction programme was delivered at the Prisoner Development Unit by staff from different departments. Prisoners expressed mixed views about the value of the induction programme, but for most it provided an adequate foundation.

Recommendation

1.17 **Reception interviews should take place in private.**

Housekeeping point

1.18 *The information booklet should provide up-to-date, accurate information.*

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.19 There was no whole-prison approach to violence reduction, particularly with regard to security and the ingress of drugs. The perceptions of vulnerable prisoners in our survey were poorer than others. Processes to keep prisoners safe were not robust but most told us they were safe. The number of violent incidents was low, although many prisoners said they had 'enemies' in the prison.
- 1.20 In our survey more prisoners than the comparator said they had felt unsafe at some time at the prison. Nevertheless, and despite a number of weaknesses in the processes in use, far fewer said they felt unsafe at the time of the survey and prisoners told us that Magilligan was a basically safe prison. There was little evidence that the illicit use of drugs and prescribed medication resulted in frequent fights or assaults. We were told that a few prisoners and their families were subject to intimidation related to drugs. In our survey, more prisoners than the comparator said that they had been victimised by staff or prisoners.
- 1.21 In our survey, vulnerable prisoners responded more negatively than other prisoners to some questions about safety and victimisation: 39% said they had felt safe on their first night and 89% that they had felt unsafe at some time against respective comparators of 81% and 36%. The Prisoner Development Unit, health care and video link were perceived as places of heightened risk. These perceptions were not reflected in levels of violence in what was largely a relaxed prison.
- 1.22 Links between safer custody, security and work to reduce the supply of drugs were poor. The security department did not attend safer custody forums. CCTV coverage on the house blocks was poor.
- 1.23 The strategic approach to bullying and violence reduction was weak; there was no comprehensive collation or analysis of indicators of bullying and data were not always accurate. Prisoner record information system management (PRISM) data indicated that there

had been 26 assaults by prisoners on prisoners in the previous six months but some of these assaults had also been recorded as fights. The accurate figure for assaults was 16, which was low.

- 1.24 Procedures to keep declared 'enemies' apart were not sufficiently robust, transparent or evidence based to maintain the confidence of staff and keep prisoners safe. The number of enemies that prisoners had was logged, but claims by prisoners that they needed protection were not investigated and the system was open to manipulation.
- 1.25 With only two adult prisons in Northern Ireland, it was difficult to disperse prisoners who presented a genuine risk to each other. They were accommodated on separate units but this did little to reassure them of protection at other times.
- 1.26 A planned strategy to challenge anti-social behaviour had not been delivered by the NIPS and the three-stage *Safer at Magilligan* procedure had been resurrected. It had only been used on six occasions in the previous six months. Most incidents were referred to the security department, victims were often moved and perpetrators dealt with by adjudications. The procedure was not embraced by staff within a wider safer custody strategy and few staff had been trained to use it. Most investigations were poor and one case had not been investigated until 20 days after the incident, by which time the alleged victim had been released.

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.

- 1.27 There had been no self-inflicted deaths in recent years. Levels of self-harm were low but better individual care and a less risk-averse approach were needed. SPAR procedures were too detailed. There was a good range of interventions for the few prisoners who were at risk of self-harm.
- 1.28 There had been no self-inflicted deaths in recent years and incidents of self-harm were low: 11 prisoners had self-harmed in the previous six months. Discussion took place with Maghaberry when a prisoner on a SPAR was to be transferred to Magilligan. Prisoners considered at serious risk and requiring a high level of care were returned to Maghaberry, but this was rare. An average of seven SPAR booklets were opened each month.
- 1.29 Too much focus was given to completing the detailed requirements of SPARs rather than identifying underlying concerns and finding alternative responses. Camera recorded observation cells, placing prisoners on 15-minute observations, and degrading anti-ligature clothing and bedding were all frequently used. No log was kept of these procedures, which

were often too risk averse. The authority of the Duty Governor was required to place a prisoner in these conditions but this was often obtained on the telephone rather than the Duty Governor interviewing the prisoner and signing the SPAR booklet. Most SPARs were opened for only a short time – on average for four days.

- 1.30 Although SPARs included some evidence of supportive interactions, assessments, care plans and the record of reviews needed improvement. Care plans were often vague and rarely identified the actions needed. Reviews usually included residential officers and health care staff and occasionally sentence managers or probation staff.
- 1.31 Better links were needed between safer custody, violence reduction and substance misuse to establish the extent to which some prisoners self-harmed to secure moves to another house unit when they were feeling under threat from other prisoners. The safer custody officer completed a detailed audit of all SPAR procedures but more focus was needed on the quality of care. Staff were being trained to use SPAR procedures.
- 1.32 A range of interventions were available to support prisoners, including bereavement counselling and counselling for sexual abuse. A coping skills group had run on two occasions for prisoners regularly placed on SPARs. A well supported team of 16 Listeners worked across the establishment and could see prisoners in private.
- 1.33 A bi-monthly Safer Custody Forum was chaired by the Deputy Governor. It was not well attended and some key staff were not consistently present. Listeners were included. Prisoners who had been placed on safer custody procedures or were held in segregation were discussed. It was rare for any prisoner on SPAR monitoring to be held in segregation.

Recommendation

- 1.34 **SPAR procedures should be improved with less reliance on camera recorded observation cells and greater focus on identifying underlying concerns and providing high-quality individual care.**

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.

- 1.35 Community adult safeguarding arrangements were not applied to the prison. There were some mechanisms to identify and protect those at risk, but formal links with the local safeguarding board needed to be developed.
- 1.36 The SEHSCT did not apply community adult safeguarding arrangements to the prison. This reflected the Health and Social Care Board's position that prisoners did not meet the vulnerable adult criteria because they could not access community care services. The responsibility for

providing a safe environment for prisoners rested with prison Governors. The Trust worked with prison staff to support safer custody procedures.

- 1.37 A working group had been set up to develop a joint Health Care and Criminal Justice strategy and action plan through analysis of the current and projected social care needs of the prison population.
- 1.38 There were no formal links with the local Northern Ireland Safeguarding Board.

Recommendation

- 1.39 **The NIPS should link with the Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety (DHSSPS) and local Safeguarding Board to develop local safeguarding practices.**

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.

- 1.40 Some important elements of dynamic security had improved since the last inspection. Free-flow movement was well managed and staff supervision of prisoners on house blocks was effective. However, shortfalls remained in strategic management.
- 1.41 Important elements of dynamic security were in place and had improved since the last inspection. Relationships between staff and prisoners were generally positive, and the supervision of prisoners, particularly on the residential units, was good. The regime was well managed and generally predictable.
- 1.42 The flow of information into the Security Department had significantly improved and the number of security information reports (SIRs) had trebled since the last inspection. Information was processed and categorised quickly by security officers and was effectively communicated to staff, which allowed them to respond to immediate security issues. For example, target searching and suspicion drug testing were carried out almost immediately in response to security information.
- 1.43 Regular checks and routine searches of perimeter fences and walls took place daily along with searches of communal areas and activities buildings. Searching of prisoners was carried out respectfully and they were not routinely strip-searched in reception.
- 1.44 The prison operated a free-flow system for prisoner movements at the beginning and end of planned regime activities. Prisoner movements were effectively controlled by officers at strategic points along the route to work and education classes. Supervision was unobtrusive and allowed prisoners to walk freely in most areas of the prison.

- 1.45 The restrictions on prisoners from Foyleview moving within the secure compound had been lifted since the previous inspection. In contrast, the whole establishment was still locked down whenever an alarm bell was activated.
- 1.46 There remained shortfalls in the strategic approach to managing important security issues. There was no local security strategy and little to indicate that key security threats specific to Magilligan were always identified or assessed. Security committee meetings were poorly attended, security objectives were not agreed and sharing of information was limited. Links to violence reduction were under-developed (see main recommendation S37). The standing agenda was incomplete and did not include an analysis of SIRs or any other information.
- 1.47 Levels of drug availability and use were high. In our survey, 40% of prisoners against the comparator of 32% said it was easy to get drugs. The mandatory drug testing (MDT) random positive rate for the six months to April 2014 was 11.9% with a spike of 26.3% in December 2013. However, there were no disciplinary consequences of a positive test result, and MDT provided little deterrent.
- 1.48 The approach to intelligence-led supply reduction was reactive and largely effective in identifying drug users, but a more integrated, strategic approach to supply reduction was needed.

Recommendations

- 1.49 **A local security strategy should be put in place to manage the specific security needs of Magilligan.**
- 1.50 **Alarm bells should not automatically result in the whole regime being locked down.**
- 1.51 **Disciplinary procedures should be used as a deterrent to known drug abuse.**

Incentives and earned privileges

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.52 The PREPS was well managed and applied consistently. The small number of prisoners on basic level were managed through individual care plans and they had a reasonable regime.
- 1.53 The PREPS policy described how the scheme worked, how prisoners could progress and the standards of expected behaviour. The scheme was well publicised and understood by prisoners and staff.

- 1.54 At the time of inspection, 56% of prisoners were on the enhanced level of the scheme, 41% on standard and 3% on basic.
- 1.55 The scheme offered differentials in access to private cash, computer games and visits and it was applied consistently across the prison. The regime for prisoners on basic level was better than we usually see and included periods of association and full access to work, education and gym activities.
- 1.56 Prisoners on basic level were managed through individual care plans which set and monitored behaviour improvement targets. Plans were reviewed weekly until all targets had been met and the prisoner was promoted to standard level.
- 1.57 There was some evidence that the scheme was helping to encourage prisoners to improve and maintain behaviour; in our survey more prisoners than the comparator said they were treated fairly (65% v 53%), and that the scheme encouraged them to change their behaviour (53% v 47%). Despite this, the linking of pay to PREPS level was reducing incentives to work (see paragraph 3.9).

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.58 Disciplinary hearings were conducted fairly. Audio recording of all hearings was good practice. The number of reported incidents involving use of force was commendably low but governance was poor. Living conditions in segregation were good. Relationships between staff and prisoners were also good but the regime for longer-stay prisoners was poor and re-integration planning was weak. Although the average length of stay was reasonably short, the use of segregation was high. Governance was poor and authorisation documents did not consistently indicate that segregation was justified.

Disciplinary procedures

- 1.59 The number of formal adjudications was not excessive. Records of hearings were clearly written and reflected proceedings which had been conducted fairly. The hearings that we observed were very good. Proceedings were audio recorded, which was good practice.
- 1.60 Punishments were fair and there were examples of adjudicating governors dismissing cases for lack of evidence or anomalies. Monthly statistics on the number and nature of adjudications were collated but there was little evidence that these were noted, categorised or used to identify and address trends. However, a punishment tariff had been published and was used consistently.

- 1.61 The appeals process was explained to prisoners by the adjudicating Governor directly after the formal hearing. There was no evidence that unofficial or collective punishments were being used individually or systematically.

Recommendation

- 1.62 **Information about the nature of adjudications should be used strategically to help identify and address trends and patterns.**

Good practice

- 1.63 The recording of adjudication hearings added to the transparency of the process and provided additional reassurance about fairness.

The use of force

- 1.64 Recorded use of force was low. During the six months before the inspection, there had been 67 incidents involving the use of force. About half of these had not involved control and restraint techniques, and 90% had been spontaneous. The management and monitoring of the use of force were poor.
- 1.65 Links between violence reduction, the Security Committee and the Senior Management Team had not been adequately developed and the dedicated Use of Force Committee, responsible for oversight and governance, rarely met. Information about the nature of the incident, its location, the religion, ethnicity and age of the prisoner was not analysed, and there was no evidence of information being used to address patterns or trends (see paragraph 2.30).
- 1.66 The completion of documentation was poor and important information, particularly from governor grades, was frequently missing. Written accounts by officers often did not describe events adequately or at all.
- 1.67 Only 38% of officers had received up-to-date training in control and restraint techniques, which was concerning.

Recommendation

- 1.68 **All prison officers should receive up-to-date training in control and restraint techniques.**

Segregation

- 1.69 The Segregation Unit comprised 17 cells located across a single landing in a secure building in the main prison compound. Two cells were equipped with CCTV cameras. There was a cage-like exercise yard outside. Living conditions were generally good. Communal areas were clean, showers adequately screened and cells were clean and well furnished. Most had televisions.

- 1.70 The use of segregation was high and had increased since the previous inspection. About 300 prisoners had been segregated during the six months before the inspection and the average length of stay was about 8.5 days. It was rare for prisoners to remain in the Segregation Unit for longer than three or four weeks. About 16% of the prisoners had been segregated under prison rule 32 (reasons of good order), 45% as punishment following an adjudication and about 38% under prison rule 35/4 (pending investigation).
- 1.71 Governance of segregation was poor. There was no strategy outlining the aims of the unit, and information about the level of segregation and length of stay was not analysed. Management links with other relevant areas of the prison, such as violence reduction, residential units and security, were poor.
- 1.72 We were not confident that the segregation of prisoners was always properly authorised or reviewed. The quality of authorisation documents that we examined was poor and in many cases did not adequately show that segregation had been justified. Planning to return prisoners to their normal location was also poor and the daily regime was impoverished.
- 1.73 Segregation reviews were completed, but there was little evidence that changes in behaviour or circumstances were monitored or acted on. Individual care plans were not raised, behaviour targets were not set and staff were not engaged in formal planning processes.
- 1.74 Officers treated prisoners respectfully but the regime was poor. The basic daily routine included showers, exercise and access to telephones, but prisoners spent almost the whole day locked in dirty cells with no meaningful activity.

Recommendations

- 1.75 **Planning to return segregated prisoners to their normal location should be developed.**
- 1.76 **The daily regime for prisoners in segregation should be improved.**

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.

- 1.77 There was no alcohol and drug strategy and this limited the integration and delivery of treatment services. The establishment had no dedicated stabilisation/detoxification unit. Psychosocial interventions were appropriate but waiting lists were long and prisoners' access to programmes was limited.

Clinical and psychosocial treatment

- 1.78 The establishment had no drug and alcohol strategy or committee in place. Drug and alcohol services were poorly integrated and only 15% of prisoners were receiving alcohol/drug treatment. Seventeen prisoners were receiving treatment from the clinical addiction service, including 11 who were receiving opioid substitution treatment, and 75 prisoners were receiving psychosocial interventions from the AD:EPT service (Alcohol and Drugs: Empowering People Through Therapy).
- 1.79 Psychosocial interventions were comprehensive and appropriate, but waiting lists were long: four weeks for assessment and up to six months for the Building Skills for Recovery course. There was no specialised drug treatment accommodation, and use of the Segregation Unit for detoxification was inappropriate.

Recommendations

- 1.80 **A comprehensive Drug and Alcohol Strategy should be drawn up and a regular multi-disciplinary Drug Strategy Committee convened to improve communication and co-ordinate services.**
- 1.81 **A dedicated and effective stabilisation/detoxification unit should be established and AD:EPT service provision extended to reflect demand for services.**
- 1.82 **Integration between the clinical substance misuse service and the AD:EPT psychosocial service should be formally developed to improve care planning and co-ordination, and the strategic approach to treatment.**



Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 Some accommodation was of a good standard but house blocks remained unfit for purpose and there was no internal sanitation. Despite some poor accommodation, prisoners in groups and individually said they were generally positive about domestic arrangements. The prison was clean and access to showers and telephones was good. Prisoners could wear their own clothes and laundry facilities were good.
- 2.2 Previous plans to close Magilligan and build a prison elsewhere in Northern Ireland had been abandoned in favour of upgrading the current prison to modern standards, although this was still many years from fruition.
- 2.3 The prison environment was marred by oppressive fences and razor wire. A range of accommodation was spread over a very large site, and lack of covered walkways remained a problem in bad weather.
- 2.4 Since the previous inspection, refurbished washing facilities and replacement cell doors had been provided on A and B wings of house block 2. Each house block housed 100 prisoners in single cells, but there was no internal sanitation and at night prisoners had to ring the bell if they wanted to use the communal toilets. There could be delays if prisoners had to wait their turn or other operational issues diverted staff. The narrow corridors were difficult to supervise and the blocks remained unfit for purpose.
- 2.5 Halward House accommodated prisoners newly transferred from Maghaberry. It provided high quality en-suite accommodation for 81 prisoners. Communal areas were bright and spacious and there was a large exercise yard. Prisoners on the ground floor had to share a cell.

- 2.6 Alpha, a 50-bed single-cell unit holding vulnerable and non-vulnerable prisoners, was clean and well maintained. There was no in-cell sanitation but prisoners had cell keys and could use communal toilets at night.
- 2.7 The accommodation in Sperrin Unit was cramped and oppressive but had been improved by the installation of wooden screening. Prisoners had access to the communal toilets at night.
- 2.8 Despite some poor accommodation, prisoners in groups and individually told us they were generally positive about the domestic arrangements for daily living.
- 2.9 There was little graffiti, although some cells had offensive wall displays.
- 2.10 Shower and toilet facilities were clean and in reasonable repair and recreational areas were well equipped. Prisoners wore their own clothes and had good access to laundry facilities.
- 2.11 Exercise yards were equipped with bench seating. Most yards were stark, although yards in Sperrin and house block 2 wings A and B had additional seating and some planting. There were enough telephones with privacy hoods.
- 2.12 Foyleview, a low-security semi-open unit of five sectional buildings outside the wall of the main prison, accommodated selected prisoners nearing the end of their sentence (see section on re-integration planning). Communal areas were cramped and untidy, and telephones outside the main buildings could not be used by prisoners later in the evening. Two more recent buildings were in better condition, but all buildings needed maintenance.
- 2.13 Prisoners had to ask officers for application forms which were not freely available. In our survey, 73% said that it was easy to make an application against the comparator of 82%. All applications and complaints were recorded on PRISM which facilitated effective tracking. Applications were generally responded to within seven days.

Recommendations

- 2.14 **The unnecessary razor wire around the site should be removed.**
- 2.15 **Foyleview should be replaced or refurbished.**

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.

- 2.16 Relationships between staff and prisoners were good. Some prisoners complained about the behaviour and attitudes of a few staff. There were no prisoner consultation meetings.
- 2.17 Relationships between staff and prisoners were good and much better than we have seen elsewhere in Northern Ireland. The positive staff culture had given management the opportunity to address issues raised in the October 2011 Prison Review Team Report, and recommendations to reform the NIPS were now being implemented.
- 2.18 In our survey, 83% of prisoners said that staff treated them with respect and 31% that staff spoke to them during association, against respective comparators of 76% and 20%. We noted many very good interactions between staff and prisoners and most officers addressed prisoners by their first name.
- 2.19 Prisoners in our groups and individually complained about the behaviour and attitude of a few staff. In our survey, 37% of prisoners against the comparator of 28% said they had been victimised by a member of staff.
- 2.20 Prisoner Forums had ceased at establishment level and were not taking place at unit level.

Recommendation

- 2.21 **Prisoner Forums should be held regularly across the prison.**

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and co-ordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic² 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.

- 2.22 Staff had limited knowledge of the needs of prisoners from minority groups and some prisoners expressed very negative views about their treatment. Most prisoners appeared to live alongside each other harmoniously but the more negative outcomes and perceptions of Catholic prisoners needed greater scrutiny. The management of diversity had improved but the negative perceptions of prisoners needed investigation.

2 The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

Strategic management

- 2.23 The prison population was homogeneous. Over 96% of prisoners identified themselves as white, and a few described themselves as coming from an ethnic minority or from an Irish Traveller background. Seventy-one per cent of prisoners described themselves as Northern Irish, 12% British and 11% Irish; 52% of prisoners said they were Catholic and 38% other Christian denominations. There were a few Muslim prisoners.
- 2.24 Considerable effort had been made since the previous inspection to improve the management of diversity. Equality and Diversity Meetings took place each month, chaired by the Deputy Governor. Attendance was erratic and reports requested from staff groups were not always submitted.
- 2.25 There was a detailed Diversity Policy and outcomes from the Equality and Diversity Meeting were linked to an action plan. Much statistical information was gathered and an improved reporting format had been introduced in April 2014. As a result, the equality and diversity meeting was beginning to function more efficiently, and it was encouraging to see that prisoner representatives had become involved.
- 2.26 It was not clear if these new initiatives were having a positive impact. There was a relaxed atmosphere in the prison and staff referred to how harmoniously prisoners from different backgrounds 'got on with one another'. There was some complacency among staff who did not seem attuned to the needs of individuals from different backgrounds. There was no diversity training for staff apart from a component during induction and it was not regarded as a priority.
- 2.27 The Equality and Diversity Co-ordinator provided good individual support to prisoners from minority groups, but he was only allocated two or three days a month to this work.
- 2.28 Complaints relating to equality and diversity were made using the standard complaints procedure. The Equality and Diversity Co-ordinator monitored this procedure and investigated complaints himself. We found no reported cases of serious discrimination, and prisoners received fair replies.

Recommendation

- 2.29 **All staff should receive diversity training.**

Protected characteristics

- 2.30 In our survey, 41% of Catholic prisoners compared to 27% of Protestant prisoners said they had been victimised by a member of staff. Data consistently showed that Catholics were disproportionately represented in relation to discipline and the IEP Scheme. These discrepancies were not being investigated robustly by managers, and prisoners were not being formally consulted with to ascertain their experiences and concerns. Whilst we received few

complaints from prisoners about religious discrimination, and prisoners from different religious backgrounds appeared to co-exist well, far more needed to be done to understand and address these poorer outcomes.

- 2.31 Prisoner representatives had made complaints that Protestant prisoners received favourable treatment with food. This had been dealt with appropriately by staff.
- 2.32 Foreign national prisoners comprised just over 3% of the population. Many were positive about support received from the Equality and Diversity Co-ordinator, for example an Asian man had been helped to buy specific spices through the shop. If foreign national prisoners had less than £20 in their account, they could receive weekly telephone calls. If they did not receive visits, they were given a free telephone call each month.
- 2.33 Foreign national support groups had been introduced which Travellers were invited to attend. However, the needs of foreign national prisoners were not identified on reception and there was no way of determining if they needed further support.
- 2.34 Immigration officials visited the prison twice a year to interview certain foreign national prisoners and other prisoners could ask to be seen on these occasions. No independent legal advice was available.
- 2.35 In our survey, 22% of prisoners identified themselves as having a disability. Prisoners with disabilities were more negative in our survey about several aspects of safety and respect than prisoners without disabilities. At the time of the inspection, 18% of the population were over the age of 50 years.
- 2.36 Some older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities benefited from living in recently refurbished and adapted accommodation on house block 2, but there was not enough suitable accommodation to meet the needs of all such men. A prisoner disability survey was about to be distributed and the Equality and Diversity Co-ordinator intended to invite a specialist disability organisation to carry out an independent audit of the needs of prisoners with disabilities.
- 2.37 Prisoners with disabilities relied on other prisoners for support with daily activities, such as cleaning cells and collecting meals. This provided an effective solution to a real problem, but was not formally managed which could have resulted in already vulnerable men being bullied. Some older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities had difficulty getting to the visits area on time. The prison van was used to transport these men around the large site. This was heavily in demand and there was no alternative transport.
- 2.38 There was very little evidence of the promotion or celebration of diversity and the needs of gay or bisexual prisoners were not addressed despite a few prisoners identifying themselves in this way.

Recommendations

- 2.39 **Prisoner Forums should be introduced to identify and address the negative perceptions of some diverse groups.**
- 2.40 **The needs of all diverse groups, including foreign nationals, prisoners with disabilities and older prisoners should be identified on reception and effectively addressed.**
- 2.41 **Arrangements for prisoners with disabilities to be supported by other prisoners should be formalised to ensure proper supervision by staff.**
- 2.42 **All aspects of diversity should be promoted.**

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.

- 2.43 The religious and pastoral needs of prisoners were well met but there remained no suitable dedicated space for worship.
- 2.44 In our survey, responses to questions about faith provision were significantly better than the comparator. Prisoners in our discussion groups and individually had similarly positive views.
- 2.45 The managing full-time chaplain was Catholic and three part-time chaplains covered all the main Christian denominations. Chaplains worked well together and there was always a chaplain on site or available. Suitable provision was made for prisoners of minority faiths or of no declared faith.
- 2.46 Three religious services took place on Sundays, including a combined service to which all denominations were welcome. Separate arrangements were made during the week for vulnerable prisoners and prisoners located on Foyleview.
- 2.47 Earlier in 2014, many complaints had been made by Catholic prisoners who felt that on two occasions they had not been given the opportunity to attend religious services. This had been taken seriously and addressed by staff and there had been no recurrence.
- 2.48 Prisoners who needed pastoral support contacted chaplains through an officer or directly during their visits to wings.

- 2.49 There was still no dedicated space for prisoners to worship and religious services were held in multi-purpose areas such as classrooms.

Recommendation

- 2.50 **A dedicated space for prisoners to worship should be permanently available.**

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.

- 2.51 Complaints were recorded and tracked efficiently using the electronic database. Most complaints were responded to within the required timescale and responses were respectful. Management oversight was good, but there was no monitoring of the number of complaints upheld or dismissed. Procedures for progressing complaints beyond the Prison Service were well publicised.
- 2.52 In our survey, 69% of prisoners against the comparator of 60% said it was easy to make a complaint. Complaint forms were accompanied by an explanation of the two-stage process and were translated into six languages.
- 2.53 Prisoners were interviewed by a governor within 24 hours of their complaint being recorded and this timescale was achieved in 84% of cases. There was a perception among some prisoners that they may be pressurised to withdraw complaints at an early stage and, in our survey, 23% against the comparator of 18% said they had been prevented from making a complaint when they had wanted to. However, we saw no evidence of this.
- 2.54 Complaints of a serious nature, including allegations of assault, discrimination, racism and complaints about staff, were passed directly to a duty governor. During the six months to May 2014, 14% of the 546 complaints had related to accommodation, 13% to staff and 12% to property.
- 2.55 Most responses were respectful in tone, with evidence of good management oversight. However, there was no monitoring of the number of complaints upheld or dismissed.
- 2.56 Procedures for progressing complaints beyond the Prison Service were well publicised on the reverse side of complaints forms and on posters on the wings.

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.

- 2.57 Two-thirds of prisoners said it was easy to access legal services. Facilities for legal visits were good. The selection of legal reference books in the library was poor.
- 2.58 In our survey, 67% of prisoners said it was easy to communicate with a solicitor and 61% to attend legal visits against respective comparators of 48% and 51%. There were no legal staff in place.
- 2.59 There were three dedicated legal visits booths in the visits building and a separate video conferencing facility which enabled good communication with solicitors or courts as required.
- 2.60 The selection of legal reference books in the library was poor and most were out-of-date.

Recommendation

- 2.61 **Prisoners should be able to refer to up-to-date legal books and publications in the library.**

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.

- 2.62 Health care services were reasonably good overall. Staffing issues, lack of effective chronic disease management, insufficient funds and creating alternative ways of working to cope with supervised swallow of medication were affecting some outcomes for prisoners. Pharmacy services needed to improve but the care provided was generally equitable. Mental health services were now good.

Governance arrangements

- 2.63 Health care services were delivered by the SEHSCT. Health care managers had been appointed in each of the three Northern Ireland prisons. Progress in the delivery of some health care services had been hampered by staff absence and the constant use of bank and agency staff. There was no senior nurse to support the operational nurse manager at Magilligan.

- 2.64 Strategic and operational forums were in place, but attendance by senior personnel was inconsistent. Local governance meetings were effective and weekly health care staff meetings took place. All staff had transferred to the SEHSCT.
- 2.65 Effective information-sharing protocols were being developed. Senior health care staff indicated that there was good collaborative working and good support from the governor and staff.
- 2.66 Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety (DHSSPS) and DoJ Ministers had established a steering group to oversee development of a joint Health Care and Criminal Justice Strategy. This was being drafted at the time of the inspection.
- 2.67 A second health needs assessment had been completed. The content and collation of data to inform performance reports needed review, notably the emergency codes of 'physical self-harm', 'overdose', 'hanging' and 'other', used to describe the nature of emergency call-outs. There was very little detail and 'other' was used to describe too wide a variety of incidents.
- 2.68 Induction programmes for new nurses had improved, but induction was not provided for all staff. Mandatory training uptake was in progress and nurses were being trained in immediate life support. Staff had appraisals but no clinical supervision.
- 2.69 We saw evidence of good staff interactions with prisoners, but not all staff wore name badges.
- 2.70 An on-site health centre delivered primary health care, mental health and addiction services. The NIPS have been informed that some prisoners said they felt unsafe at times in the health care waiting area. There was no Inpatient Unit.
- 2.71 Health care facilities were generally satisfactory. However, the cupboards in Halward House could not be decontaminated effectively and the hand washing sink needed replacement. Some infection prevention and control practice and the provision of personal protection equipment needed improvement. The medicine trolley was not chained to the wall in the Care and Separation Unit (CSU) and there was no stable-style door to the Halward treatment room. As a result, nurses said they felt vulnerable when alone with patients during a 'supervised swallow' (the supervision of prisoners taking medication to ensure that it has been swallowed). This procedure was time consuming for nursing staff and, although necessary, it restricted their ability to run other services, such as health promotion and chronic disease clinics.
- 2.72 Liaison with relevant agencies in the management of communicable diseases was good.
- 2.73 Resuscitation equipment was disorganised, out-of-date and in some cases out of its original packaging. In the van used for emergencies, oxygen was unsecured which presented a health and safety risk. Weekly checks of resuscitation and automated external defibrillator equipment were inconsistent; an officer in the CSU was unaware that automated external defibrillator equipment was available in the unit.

- 2.74 Prisoners received a detailed information pack from health care on arrival and a range of health promotion information was available. A health development worker had been appointed for the three Northern Ireland prisons, but no local initiatives had so far been introduced. Health care staff did not provide enough explanation to prisoners about their medication.
- 2.75 The provision of forensic occupational therapy services had been temporarily reduced as staff had moved to other areas in health care.
- 2.76 Health care complaints data indicated that an improvement in response time for formal complaints was required and the management of complaints needed improvement. Complaints from prisoners related principally to supervised swallowing and reduction in drug dosage.

Recommendations

- 2.77 **Staffing arrangements and management should be sufficient to ensure consistently good outcomes for prisoners.**
- 2.78 **Data should be used effectively to drive up standards of care.**
- 2.79 **An induction programme and clinical supervision should be provided for all staff.**
- 2.80 **Resuscitation equipment should be effectively organised and checked, and oxygen cylinders in the emergency van should be secured.**
- 2.81 **The management of complaints should be improved.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.82 *Staff should wear name badges.*
- 2.83 *Health care rooms in Halward House should be brought up to the required standard.*
- 2.84 *The medicine trolley should be secured to the wall in the CSU when not in use, and recorded safety checks should be undertaken on defibrillators by NIPS staff.*
- 2.85 *Health care staff should provide sufficient explanation to prisoners about their medication.*
- 2.86 *Recruitment for forensic occupational therapy vacancies should commence.*

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.87 Our survey indicated that access to health care services was generally good compared with similar prisons. A GP attended for two full days and two mornings each week and plans were in place for an additional GP session. Lagandoc GP service was used out-of-hours.

- 2.88 Data indicated that timescales for prisoners accessing health care were being met. A health care request form was available, but it was undated.
- 2.89 EMIS (Egton Medical Information System) was under review to improve data capture and reporting methods. Quality of recording varied, and not all interventions were recorded; records were not regularly audited. Electronic care records had recently been installed and was used to gather previous patient information such as prescribed medication. Nurses did not have access to the electronic care record.
- 2.90 Central management of waiting lists and secondary care referrals worked well. Staff required further training in medical read codes (specific computer codes allocated to each medical condition); one code relating to a blood-borne virus was incorrect.
- 2.91 The implementation of chronic disease clinics and the monitoring of chronic diseases had been hampered by staff shortages and the introduction of 'supervised swallow'. An audit of diabetic care undertaken by one of the GPs had revealed that diabetic prisoners could be better managed by establishing clinics for regular health checks and health promotion. As a result, diabetic clinics were to be introduced in all three Northern Ireland prisons.
- 2.92 The palliative care pathway was being reviewed and one staff member had undergone palliative care training.
- 2.93 Hepatitis B vaccinations were offered on arrival and routine flu vaccination clinics were held; tetanus vaccine were available on request also. Barrier protection was not available as the Trust operates according to departmental guidance.
- 2.94 All prisoners were routinely handcuffed during external hospital appointments and no individual risk assessments were carried out.

Recommendations

- 2.95 **The quality of recording on EMIS should be improved with regular audits of health care records.**
- 2.96 **Chronic disease management should be progressed by the multi-disciplinary team and care should be provided by staff with the relevant skills and competency.**
- 2.97 **Individual risk assessments regarding cuffing arrangements should be carried out with the involvement of health care staff for prisoners attending external hospital appointments.**
- 2.98 **Prisoners should have access to barrier protection.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.99 *Health care request forms should be dated.*
- 2.100 *All staff should receive training in read codes.*

Pharmacy

- 2.101 Dispensing services were provided by SEHSCT through the centralised pharmacy in Maghaberry Prison. This had improved the efficiency of the ordering, transport and receipt of medicines. No pharmacy staff were based in the prison.
- 2.102 A risk assessment form for in-possession medication was completed on arrival. Prisoners signed a 'medication contract' highlighting their responsibilities. There was little evidence that these risk assessments were reviewed and in-possession monitoring checks had ceased.
- 2.103 Significant work had been undertaken to reduce the number of divertible medications held in-possession. Supervised swallow had been introduced.
- 2.104 Prescribing issues were discussed at monthly GP practice meetings. The Medicines and Therapeutics Committee had not met since November 2013. Prescribing data were not routinely printed. The medication prescribed to some prisoners in the community was discontinued or changed on arrival, and GPs had begun to standardise prescribing practice to address this.
- 2.105 Schedule 2 and 3 controlled drugs were excluded from in-possession medication. Records were appropriately maintained and stock balances were accurate. Controlled drug audits were not conducted each quarter.
- 2.106 The design of rooms in the H blocks prevented staff from seeing prisoners fully at all times. Nurses on house block 3 and Halward said that medicines to be administered as 'supervised swallow' at night were pre-dispensed into separate containers placed on a tray for night-time medicine. This practice was unsafe.
- 2.107 On a few occasions, we saw prisoners left unsupervised in the treatment room, with in-possession medication unlocked. Formal records were not maintained of receipts of stock medicines and the disposal of medicines. A few medicine labels on the medicine administration records charts were faded and illegible. All unused medicines were disposed of which had resulted in considerable waste of medication with associated financial implications.
- 2.108 Staff stated that they did not know of the procedure for disseminating lessons learned from medication incidents in other Northern Ireland prisons.

Recommendations

- 2.109 **In-possession monitoring checks and risk assessment reviews should be carried out in accordance with Trust policy.**
- 2.110 **Controlled drug audits should be carried out each quarter and records maintained of all stock medications. Unused medications should be appropriately disposed of.**

- 2.111 **'Supervised swallow' administration should be carried out to Nursing and Midwifery Council standards.**
- 2.112 **A procedure should be introduced to disseminate lessons learned from medication incidents in other prisons.**
- 2.113 **In-possession medication should be supplied to prisoners from a room other than the treatment room.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.114 *All medicine labels should be legible.*
- 2.115 *Prescribing data should be used to demonstrate value for money and to promote effective medicines management.*

Dentistry

- 2.116 Dental services were good, waiting lists were not long and urgent cases were seen the following day. The DHSSPS guidance for decontamination compliance, HTM 01-05, requiring dental practices to have 'a clean to dirty flow with a separate room for decontamination of instruments', was not achieved. Work had started on a business case to send all instruments to the decontamination and sterilisation unit in the Ulster Hospital.

Recommendation

- 2.117 **Dental practice should comply with HTM 01-05.**

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.118 Mental health services had improved since the previous inspection. The Mental Health Support Team consisted of one full-time mental health nurse and one dual qualified nurse who attended one to two days a week, depending on operational needs. There was an average waiting time of three weeks for prisoners to be seen by a member of the team. A consultant psychiatrist attended every fortnight. There were good relationships between mental health and primary care staff.
- 2.119 Our survey indicated that 33% of prisoners had a mental health or emotional problem. Mental health staff said that the number of prisoners with an acute or enduring mental health diagnosis was low. Their caseload consisted mainly of prisoners with anxiety and depressive illness.

- 2.120 Lack of suitable space restricted the group work delivered by mental health nurses. They held mental health well men clinics, provided stress packs and ran a mindfulness group (distraction technique).

Recommendation

- 2.121 **More group work activities should be provided to meet the needs of prisoners with mental health issues.**

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.

- 2.122 Menus were varied and the portion sizes were good. More than half the prisoners were positive about the quality of food. Some dining in association was possible in most residential blocks. Consultation arrangements needed improvement.
- 2.123 In our survey, 55% of prisoners said that the food was good or very good against the comparator of 26%.
- 2.124 The three-week menu cycle provided a wide variety of dietary and cultural options; fresh vegetables and fruit were available each day. Catering staff were amenable to changes of menu orders providing reasonable notice was given. The evening meal was hot at the point of service but was served at 4.45pm, which was early. Many prisoners were able to dine in association, although not all residential units had enough space for all prisoners to do this.
- 2.125 The kitchen and serveries were clean but not all serveries orderlies were appropriately dressed; we saw one orderly serving food wearing shorts and a vest. Food comment books were not provided and catering staff relied principally on official complaints as a measure of prisoner satisfaction. A catering survey undertaken earlier in the year had resulted in minor changes to the menu, but the response rate was only about 19%.

Recommendation

- 2.126 **Food comment books should be provided on wings and comments should be responded to by catering staff.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.127 *Serveries orderlies should be appropriately dressed.*

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.128 Most prisoners were content with the range and prices of items. However, some new arrivals had to wait too long to receive their first order. Prisoners had access to catalogue shopping and could purchase newspapers and magazines. There were no systematic consultation arrangements.
- 2.129 In our survey, 70% of prisoners said that the prison shop provided enough choice. Prisoners could use the shop once a week but some new prisoners could wait up to 10 days to receive their first order depending on their day of arrival.
- 2.130 Although the shop obtained items that were not on the product list to meet the needs of individual prisoners, there was little planned consultation with prisoners about the list. However, the shop manager attended diversity meetings where prisoners' views were expressed.
- 2.131 Prisoners had access to catalogue shopping and could buy a wide range of newspapers and magazines.

Recommendation

- 2.132 **Prisoners should be able to receive shop items within 24 hours of arrival.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.133 *Prisoners should be formally consulted about the product list.*



Purposeful activity

Purposeful activity

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.³

- 3.1 Time out of cell was good and prisoners had regular access to exercise and association. The regime was often unnecessarily disrupted by short periods of lock-down and restrictions on movement following incidents around the prison.
- 3.2 There was reasonable time out of cell and most prisoners had about 9.4 hours a day. The average recorded time out of cell was 10.2 hours which was an over-estimate, as it exceeded the time allowed for the core day.
- 3.3 Prisoners who had not been allocated to an activity were only locked up for about an hour each morning during activity periods to allow wings to be cleaned. Roll checks after this time showed that all prisoners were unlocked.
- 3.4 Free flow was well managed and prisoners had access to exercise yards and daily association. On some house units (Alpha, Sperrin, house block 2 A and B wings and Foyleview), prisoners were not confined to their rooms and had limited access around the units at the end of the core day.
- 3.5 Frequent disruptions to the regime could reduce the time prisoners were out of their cells (see section on security).

³ 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.

- 3.6 The quality of education, vocational training and work provision was inadequate. The strategic leadership and management of learning and skills provision had been adversely affected by staff changes and were in a state of flux. The self-evaluation process was weak. There was not enough purposeful activity and too many prisoners were unemployed. The education curriculum had narrowed significantly and provision largely comprised essential skills in literacy, numeracy and ICT. Progression opportunities were poor. For those in activities, the quality of teaching and learning was good. A limited range of vocational training was provided and uptake was good. The vocational curriculum did not reflect employment market trends closely enough. Too few prisoners were employed in appropriately challenging and realistic work. Standards of work were high but too few prisoners achieved accreditation above level 1. The library was valued by many prisoners but facilities on Foyleview were poor.
- 3.7 The Education and Training Inspectorate made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:
- Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work: satisfactory;
 - Quality of learning and skills and work provision: satisfactory; and
 - Leadership and management of learning and skills and work: inadequate.

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.8 The strategic leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities had been adversely affected by staff changes and budget reductions. While the acting managers for education and skills were working hard to manage and maintain the provision, high levels of uncertainty were evident and the breadth of the activities was declining. There had been few discernible improvements in the provision and some aspects had regressed.
- 3.9 The arrangements for self-evaluation and quality improvement planning had regressed for some time and were weak. The use of data to plan, monitor and review the quality and impact of the learning and skills provision was under-developed. The wage structure did not provide sufficient incentives for work. Prisoners were paid on the basis of their PREPS level which meant that pay for those who were employed and unemployed could be identical.

Recommendations

- 3.10 **The leadership and management of the learning and skills provision should be improved.**
- 3.11 **More effective procedures should be developed for self-evaluation and quality improvement planning, including the improved use of data to review and monitor the quality and impact of the provision.**

Provision of activities

- 3.12 The education curriculum had narrowed considerably since the previous inspection and largely comprised the essential skills of literacy, numeracy and ICT, which were delivered to good effect through a partnership arrangement with the local further education college. The curriculum did not meet the needs and interests of all prisoners, nor did it provide appropriate progression opportunities. Only a few programmes were offered at level 2 or above, including Open University courses, and these were gradually being reduced. There was very little provision for prisoners who had already achieved qualifications at level 2 or above.
- 3.13 Vocational training was popular with prisoners and there were waiting lists for most training courses. The curriculum was too narrow with most training in construction areas. There were 78 places in the main prison workshops, of which 63 were accredited training, including computer technicians, furniture making, joinery, metal fabrication, painting and decorating, plastering, and wall and floor tiling. The training was matched more to the skills and interests of the instruction staff than to the growth or priority skill areas in the economy. While most training was accredited, this was largely at level 1, which was below the level required for progression to relevant employment.
- 3.14 Just under 60 prisoners were employed in gardens and grounds maintenance, recycling, power washing and the Foyleview community workshop. Almost all prisoners in these jobs were engaged purposefully and acquired a good work attitude and ethic, with many taking considerable pride in work outcomes. Very few acquired any accredited qualifications for their work. The vast majority of the remaining 163 prison jobs were wing-based orderlies undertaking cleaning and other mundane activities.
- 3.15 Overall, there was not enough purposeful activity for the population. Just under half the population at the time of the inspection were not participating in education, vocational training or work activities. They were using the limited number of spaces they had available reasonably well ('participation' in this context meaning the absolute numbers involved rather than using what they had).

Recommendation

- 3.16 **A more progressive, broader curriculum should be provided to ensure that prisoners have enough opportunity to achieve accredited qualifications at the appropriate level recognised by employers.**

Quality of provision

- 3.17 The quality of teaching, training and learning was good in the classes that we observed and there were very good relationships between staff and prisoners. The prisoners had good experiences in the classrooms and engaged well in their learning. However, the progress of some prisoners working at a higher level was constrained because of the wide range of ability levels in some classes.

- 3.18 A high priority was given to the development of prisoners' essential skills in literacy, numeracy and ICT. The initial assessment of the levels of prior attainment in the essential skills, and the identification of prisoners in need of additional learning support, were systematic; the information was used well by the tutors to inform their classroom practice.
- 3.19 The vocational training observed was of a good quality; prisoners were engaged and motivated and acquired a positive work ethic and attitude. The furniture production and metal fabrication workshops provided realistic working environments in which prisoners developed and applied their practical skills. The relationships between staff and prisoners were good and promoted a positive climate conducive to learning. Prisoners developed good standards of practical skills, often above the level at which they were assessed and accredited.
- 3.20 The provision of English for speakers of other languages was good. The few foreign national prisoners who participated made good progress and had access to good quality resources to support learning.
- 3.21 Prisoners engaged well in purposeful recreational classes such as art, music, writing, book share and historical records. The standard of the work was mostly good and was shared with a wider audience through the prison magazine and other publications. Prisoners undertaking art programmes did not have access to appropriate accommodation or resources to support their learning. There were not enough opportunities for accreditation in recreational classes.
- 3.22 The health and safety practices and procedures in the workshops and transport areas in Foyleview were not rigorous enough to ensure that potential hazards and risks were minimised.

Recommendation

- 3.23 **Health and safety practices in Foyleview should be reviewed and changes made as necessary to minimise risk.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.24 Achievements by prisoners in essential skills were good, although too few progressed up the levels, particularly to level 2. Essential skills were not well integrated with vocational training and prisoners were not given enough opportunity to apply their skills in meaningful, work-related contexts. Too little attention was paid to the development of prisoners' enterprise, work-readiness, or wider employability skills.
- 3.25 Most prisoners on accredited training programmes were retained and achieved the qualification. However, the level of attainment was mostly level 1 which did not enhance their employability sufficiently. The individual student learning agreements did not incorporate adequately the outcomes from initial assessment and were not used effectively to review progress or to set targets.

Recommendation

- 3.26 **Links between the essential skills and vocational training programmes should be improved to enhance prisoners' progression and employment opportunities.**

Library

- 3.27 The library was well maintained and valued by most prisoners. A good range of books included contemporary titles and up-to-date magazines which reflected prisoners' needs and interests. However, there was a lack of up-to-date legal books and materials to support vocational training and education provision in essential skills. Prisoners undertaking Open University qualifications had access to the internet to support their studies, which was an improvement from the previous inspection.
- 3.28 Prisoners had good access to the library during the week but there was no access at weekends. During this inspection the library management software was not operating and prisoners were unable to borrow books.
- 3.29 Library access for prisoners in Foyleview was inadequate and a deterrent to the promotion of a culture of reading and supporting literacy development.

Recommendation

- 3.30 **Prisoners should have access to the library at weekends and facilities in Foyleview should be upgraded.**

Housekeeping point

- 3.31 *The library management software issue should be addressed.*

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.

- 3.32 Physical education was well promoted across the prison and was highly valued by the prisoners who participated. However, overall participation rates needed improvement.

- 3.33 Physical education was promoted well across the prison and valued highly by those who participated. Physical education was led effectively by an acting senior officer and team of five instructors who were developing the programme beyond the gym and general activity sessions. Important initiatives such as the Duke of Edinburgh's award were being implemented to good effect.
- 3.34 The relationships between prisoners and instructors were positive and purposeful, and led to increased levels of motivation, health and well-being. A good start had been made on introducing a fitness appraisal and assessment programme for prisoners.
- 3.35 Planning for the strategic development of physical education was weak and the participation rates of prisoners in such activities were lower than they should have been. Only a few prisoners were participating in accredited programmes. There was a need to review and develop the physical education and health promotion programmes for older and vulnerable prisoners. Co-ordination between physical education, health care and education was not good enough and a coherent, whole-prison approach to increasing participation rates and improving healthy living needed to be explored and developed.
- 3.36 The gym was spacious and well equipped, although it was often under-used. A number of key recommendations from the previous inspection had not been progressed sufficiently and the lack of a suitable all-weather outdoor surface continued to constrain the range of activities. Prisoners in Foyleview had limited gym access during the week. There was a need to review the physical education facilities in the small gym areas across the residential accommodation to ensure they were safe and in good working order.

Recommendations

- 3.37 **The overall strategic development of physical education should be reviewed and the number of prisoners who regularly participate in such activities should be increased.**
- 3.38 **Outdoor facilities, including a suitable all-weather outdoor surface, should be provided.**
- 3.39 **A full risk assessment of the fitness equipment on the wings should be undertaken.**



Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1 Despite some gaps in the Resettlement Strategy, prisoners had good access to a broad range of resettlement services. The modern Prisoner Development Unit was a good environment for prisoners and staff, and encouraged joint working. Home leave was used extensively to support resettlement planning, but decisions needed to be more effectively recorded.
- 4.2 A local Resettlement Strategy listed the resettlement services available, but did not include the opportunities at Foyleview or describe how the needs of indeterminate prisoners would be met. The NIPS had still not conducted a needs assessment of the population. However, a broad range of resettlement services was available, access was good and we judged that provision was likely to meet most needs. There were no regular strategic meetings and no resettlement pathway action plans, but we saw some evidence that, despite the absence of formal structures, there was a sense of progression and responsiveness to prisoners' needs.
- 4.3 The Prisoner Development Unit was located in excellent accommodation to which prisoners had supervised access. Case managers (prison officers) and sentence managers (probation officers) were appropriately trained and shared offices, facilitating good communication. They were also in close proximity to psychologists, administrators and most providers of resettlement services, which promoted effective partnership working. Prisoner Development Unit staff felt respected in the prison, and most staff in other departments understood the purpose of the Unit.
- 4.4 Various forms of home leave were used extensively to support resettlement plans. In the previous six months, 1,074 leave licences had been issued to 411 prisoners, much higher than we generally see in closed prisons. Less than 1% of released men had failed to return to the prison, and there were no records of any serious further offences. There had been 22 proven adjudications for less serious infringements of home leave licence conditions.

- 4.5 Prisoners could attend Decision Making Boards to present their case, and most men had a period of home leave before their release. Board members had the necessary information to make good quality decisions, but the rationale for their decisions was not recorded in enough detail. Although they followed some general guidelines, a steady flow of judicial reviews and discrepancies between practice at Maghaberry and Magilligan prisons had the potential to undermine good decision making. In light of experience in England in the previous year (where prisoners on leave from prison had committed serious further offences), tighter accountability procedures were needed. PPANI referrals were made as appropriate to notify partner agencies of home leave, and police in the release area were routinely informed.

Recommendation

- 4.6 **The rationale for home leave decisions should be carefully recorded.**

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.

- 4.7 Risk of harm and re-offending assessments were prompt and thorough. Sentence plans were up to date. Most prisoners were seen regularly by case or sentence managers. Public protection arrangements were generally good, but some staff needed greater awareness of their responsibilities. Prisoners who presented a significant risk of harm were carefully managed. Categorisation processes were appropriate. The strategy for indeterminate sentenced prisoners was unclear.
- 4.8 Prisoners arrived with an assessment, case management and evaluation score (an assessment of the likelihood of re-offending) and a risk of serious harm assessment. Most also had a sentence plan, which was usually prepared within 20 days of sentencing. The availability of these documents promoted good outcomes for prisoners because staff had immediate access to the information they needed to allocate activities and make referrals to resettlement services.
- 4.9 Prisoners sentenced under the Criminal Justice Order 2009 (CJO) cases and subject to supervision on release had a sentence manager and a case manager jointly responsible for managing their sentence. In our survey, prisoners reported more positively than in comparator prisons about their interactions with these staff, and we saw that most contacts were planned and regular. The electronic case note system was generally used well to share information and record discussions.

- 4.10 A further group of about 80 non-CJO prisoners, many of whom were sex offenders on long sentences, were seen less frequently. Some had not received enough support or challenge from staff in the Prisoner Development Unit. More needed to be done to ensure that contact levels were appropriate.
- 4.11 Prisoners serving CJO sentences of under 12 months were not subject to supervision on release, and did not have a sentence manager or formal sentence plan. However, each had a nominated case manager and a resettlement plan based on a needs assessment.
- 4.12 Offender management files were well organised. Sentence plans were simple, and most contained good quality objectives focused on reducing risk. Reviews were scheduled six-monthly and most were completed on time.
- 4.13 The prison held six-monthly risk management meetings for all prisoners posing a risk of serious harm, at which risk management plans were agreed and monitored. These meetings were also used on an adhoc basis to share and resolve concerns about particular prisoners. Relevant prisoners were referred to PPANI three months before release to agree a community risk management plan.

Recommendation

- 4.14 **All prisoners should receive ongoing planned contact from their case/sentence managers which is proportionate to their risk and need.**

Public protection

- 4.15 Only seven prisoners were subject to routine mail or telephone monitoring during our inspection, mostly for intelligence related reasons. These decisions were reviewed each month, and few men were monitored for long periods. Residential staff were responsible for checking and recording all outgoing mail, and were notified of any restrictions in place for individual prisoners.
- 4.16 Many sex offenders had restrictions on contact put in place by the sentencing judge. These were known to sentence/case managers and were recorded on the prison's IT system to prevent contact in visits.
- 4.17 Prisoner Development Unit staff had a good understanding of public protection, including safeguarding children arrangements, and knew how to manage risks which had not been identified in court. The prison regularly hosted local assessment panel meetings in support of this work. However, some staff in other departments were not sufficiently aware of their responsibilities to protect the public. We witnessed an incident where inadequate investigation took place before approving contact between a prisoner convicted of a sex offence and an unknown female visitor.

Recommendation

- 4.18 **All staff should understand public protection procedures and their responsibilities to protect the public from harm.**

Categorisation

- 4.19 Prisoners' security categories were reviewed every six months, and a variety of reports were used to inform decision making. Reviews were up-to-date, and a reasonable proportion of prisoners were downgraded at each Board.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.20 A booklet about indeterminate sentences, published in March 2014, contained some useful information. However, despite the presence of six prisoners on life sentences, four on indeterminate custodial sentences and a further 37 on extended sentences, the booklet made no mention of Magilligan or Foyleview.
- 4.21 The prison had altered the eligibility criteria for Alpha and Foyleview, to include prisoners on indeterminate sentences, and was now deciding how they might benefit from the home leave and working out opportunities on Foyleview. Foyleview's contribution to Northern Ireland's strategy for prisoners on indeterminate sentences was unclear. Parole processes were up to date. There were no additional support mechanisms for prisoners on indeterminate sentences.

Re-integration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.22 Prisoners' resettlement needs were appropriately assessed on sentencing. Referral procedures to resettlement services were effective. Pre-release planning was good but the role of Foyleview needed clarification. Accommodation advice and support was good. NIACRO staff provided education and employment support but links with employers were under-exploited and careers advice was inadequate. There were good links with community health and drug services. Finance, benefit and debt advice was good. There was excellent support for prisoners to remain in contact with family and friends. A comprehensive range of programmes were delivered and waiting lists were well managed.
- 4.23 All prisoners received an assessment of need shortly after sentencing and appropriate referrals were made. In our survey, prisoners responded more positively than in comparator prisons about the support they received before release.

- 4.24 Category C and D prisoners could apply to live in Foyleview, where most prisoners benefited from regular town visits and home leave. A few prisoners did voluntary work in the community, and two were in paid employment. These valuable resettlement opportunities could have been enhanced by greater focus on the accreditation of skills and helping men to find work. The role of the Unit was not clear, nor was its relationship to the newly re-opened Prisoner Assessment Unit in Belfast.
- 4.25 Prisoners subject to supervision on release were seen by their case manager eight weeks beforehand to prepare a release plan and to develop licence conditions, which were then agreed with the NIPS, usually by video-link.
- 4.26 Short-term prisoners, who were not subject to supervision on release, did not have a release plan, but could take a pre-release course which offered some post-release support.

Accommodation

- 4.27 Two officers trained by Belfast Housing Rights provided initial accommodation advice, and had dealt with 176 referrals in the previous year. Two trained prisoner peer mentors delivered presentations at induction and to prisoners on request and provided advice on housing issues.
- 4.28 Complex matters were referred to two part-time staff from Belfast Housing Rights who were located in the prison. Referrals were received from individuals in need and from the statutory and voluntary sectors. During 2013 to 2014, Belfast Housing Rights staff had advised 190 prisoners and acted as the direct link between the prison and the Northern Ireland Housing Executive, the statutory housing provider. Referrals were made primarily to the Housing Executive or to hostels. No private landlord accommodation was available for referrals.
- 4.29 NIACRO had also provided housing advice to about 40 prisoners during the year.
- 4.30 In our survey, 46% of prisoners against the comparator of 37% knew where to find housing advice, and services were well used.
- 4.31 The NIPS did not monitor accommodation outcomes, and the only available information was based on the number of homeless discharge grants made to prisoners.

Recommendation

- 4.32 **Accommodation outcomes should be monitored and the information should be used to inform and develop housing services.**

Education, training and employment

- 4.33 There were effective links between learning and skills and the Prisoner Development Unit. The initial assessment of prisoners' education and training needs was rigorous and identified deficits in their literacy or numeracy skills and other learning needs. This information was shared with sentence plan managers and the Work Allocation Board.

- 4.34 NIACRO delivered accredited pre-release courses to prisoners and a range of other services, including Job Track, links to employers and advice on self-employment and business start-ups. NIACRO continued to support prisoners after release and delivered short courses aimed at enhancing their employment skills.
- 4.35 A few prisoners had paid employment and some undertook work placements each day in a range of community or voluntary settings. However, collaboration with employers to prepare prisoners for release and resettlement, including work experience, was under-exploited. Careers guidance for prisoners at key points during their sentence was not of high enough quality. Too few opportunities were provided for prisoners to achieve relevant accredited qualifications at level 2 or above, which limited their employment potential on release.

Recommendations

- 4.36 **Links with employers should be improved to enhance prisoners' preparation for release and resettlement.**
- 4.37 **Effective, high quality careers advice and guidance should be introduced.**

Health care

- 4.38 There was no formal health care pathway, but there were good links with community health services. Prisoners who had been at the establishment for more than a month were given a letter for their GP.
- 4.39 The mental health multi-disciplinary team adhered to Promoting Quality Care and Discharge Protocols for prisoners with complex mental health needs. Mental health staff facilitated in-reach support when required before discharge; there was no social work contribution to social histories or liaison with community social services.
- 4.40 One of the proposals of the joint Health Care and Criminal Justice Strategy (see section on health care governance) was to review the strategic direction for resettlement and clarify the role of social care in the prisons.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.41 Prisoners were offered a pre-release meeting with AD:EPT. An AD:EPT post-release support service in the community was offered to prisoners who had undertaken AD:EPT programmes in custody. Prisoners with clinical treatment needs were referred to local community addiction services before release.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.42 A NIACRO advice worker attended one day a week and typically saw between eight and 10 prisoners to discuss housing, fuel debt and outstanding loans; 371 prisoners had received this

service during 2013. In our survey, 32% of prisoners against the comparator of 25% said they knew where to get help with finances on release.

- 4.43 Cases were prioritised according to release date or urgency. There was a waiting list of 197 prisoners, 16 of whom were due for release within the next four weeks. Most referrals came from case managers. Follow-up support could be arranged with NIACRO's offices in Derry/Londonderry, Belfast and Portadown.
- 4.44 Work was under way to identify a bank prepared to open accounts for prisoners. The Service Level Agreement with NIACRO included the delivery of three accredited debt management courses.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.45 In our survey, prisoners reported more positively than in comparator prisons on the support they received to maintain contact with family and friends. Sixty-five per cent of prisoners were more than 50 miles from home which affected their ability to receive visits. However, NIACRO provided a bus service to the prison from main towns each week, and families could request a free lift to the prison from the nearest railway station.
- 4.46 Barnardo's worked in partnership with prison officers to deliver a range of programmes for prisoners and their families. Courses finished with an extended family day visit, where prisoners had an opportunity under supervision to practise the skills they had learned. Barnardo's staff also offered individual support to prisoners and their families.
- 4.47 A family officer offered practical support to visitors and organised fortnightly child-centred visits. These visits included time for the family as a whole, and time for fathers to spend on their own with their children. The Big Book Share (a project for prisoners to record stories for their children) played a useful part in these events. The family officer post was not always staffed, which affected the frequency and extent of this work.
- 4.48 Prisoners could receive at least one visit a week, although those on the basic regime were limited to one hour. The telephone booking system was easy to use, with an option to leave a message if the line was engaged. Families could also book a visit while they were at the prison. Visitors could hand in clothes and money on arrival.
- 4.49 The visitors' centre was welcoming and friendly. Entry procedures were relaxed and respectful, but could be protracted on busy days, delaying entry to the visits hall. A passive drug dog routinely assisted search procedures, and a closed visit was offered to any visitor on whom the dog had indicated.
- 4.50 Prisoners had worked with a community arts group to soften the institutional feel of the visits room with wall paintings and hangings. Visitors valued the trolley service for refreshments and the supervised crèche area. Supervision by prison officers was unobtrusive and families were able to show open affection. Prisoners did not have to wear any identifying clothing.

- 4.51 Vulnerable prisoners and their families were generally asked to sit in a part of the visits room which did not overlook the crèche. Vulnerable prisoners said that they felt stigmatised and that their families were sometimes intimidated by other visitors.

Recommendations

- 4.52 **Closed visits should not be imposed automatically on a dog indication.**
- 4.53 **Vulnerable prisoners' concerns about the safety of their families while visiting should be investigated and resolved.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.54 The psychology department managed programmes on motivation, offending behaviour and anger management, delivered by prison officers, probation and psychology staff. The programmes included the Motivational Enhancement Group, preparing prisoners for group work interventions, enhanced thinking skills, addressing cognitive deficits associated with offending, sex offender treatment programme and the alcohol-related violence programme.
- 4.55 The range of programmes was comprehensive and appropriate to the category of the prison. Five Motivational Enhancement Group programmes were scheduled each year, feeding into enhanced thinking skills programmes. The core sex offender treatment programme was due to replace the suspended rolling sex offender treatment programme in September 2014; 16 prisoners were on the waiting list for the sex offender treatment programme.
- 4.56 Waiting lists were long for some courses, but they were well managed and prisoners were allocated according to their release dates.
- 4.57 An appropriate range of non-accredited programmes was provided by the Resettlement Unit, including anger management, substance misuse education programmes, the GOALS pre-release target-setting programme and a range of family and victim-oriented programmes.
- 4.58 Staff worked with sex offenders in denial of their offences on more general aspects of attitudes, thinking and behaviour to begin the process of engagement.
- 4.59 The departments delivering programmes had very good links with other departments and community agency providers.



Summary of recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice

The reference number at the end of each recommendation, housekeeping point or example of good practice refers to its paragraph location in the main report.

Main recommendations

To the director-general, NIPS

- 5.1 House blocks should be replaced with more suitable, safe accommodation with appropriate sanitation arrangements, and covered walkways should be installed across the site. (S39)
- 5.2 The Northern Ireland wide role of Foyleview in preparing prisoners for resettlement into the community, including those coming towards the end of long sentences, should be clarified and better co-ordinated. (S41)

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.3 An effective Violence Reduction Strategy, incorporating anti-bullying procedures specific to Magilligan, should be implemented in consultation with prisoners. (S37)
- 5.4 The governance of segregation and use of force should be sufficient to ensure that their use is appropriate and proportionate. (S38)
- 5.5 The participation rates in education, training and work should be increased, and a broader range of more challenging work activities should be provided to meet the needs of all prisoners. The pay structure should provide greater incentives to engage in purposeful activity. (S40)

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.6 Prisoners should be given sufficient notice of transfers. (1.6)
- 5.7 Prisoners being transported to the prison should be well treated. (1.7)
- 5.8 Vulnerable prisoners should not be subject to verbal abuse by other prisoners when they are being transported to the prison. (1.8)

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

- 5.9 The NIPS should link with the Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety and local Safeguarding Board to develop local safeguarding practices. (1.39)

Residential units

- 5.10 Foyleview should be replaced or refurbished. (2.15)

Health services

- 5.11 A procedure should be introduced to disseminate lessons learned from medication incidents in other prisons. (2.112)

Early days in custody

- 5.12 Reception interviews should take place in private. (1.17)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.13 SPAR procedures should be improved with less reliance on camera recorded observation cells and greater focus on identifying underlying concerns and providing high quality individual care. (1.34)

Security

- 5.14 A local Security Strategy should be put in place to manage the specific security needs of Magilligan. (1.49)

5.15 Alarm bells should not automatically result in the whole regime being locked down. (1.50)

5.16 Disciplinary procedures should be used as a deterrent to known drug abuse. (1.51)

Discipline

5.17 Information about the nature of adjudications should be used strategically to help identify and address trends and patterns. (1.62)

5.18 All prison officers should receive up-to-date training in control and restraint techniques. (1.68)

5.19 Planning to return segregated prisoners to their normal location should be developed. (1.75)

5.20 The daily regime for prisoners in segregation should be improved. (1.76)

Substance misuse

5.21 A comprehensive Drug and Alcohol Strategy should be drawn up and a regular multi-disciplinary Drug Strategy Committee convened to improve communication and co-ordinate services. (1.80)

5.22 A dedicated and effective stabilisation/detoxification unit should be established and AD: EPT service provision extended to reflect demand for services. (1.81)

5.23 Integration between the clinical substance misuse service and the AD:EPT psychosocial service should be formally developed to improve care planning and co-ordination, and the strategic approach to treatment. (1.82)

Residential units

5.24 The unnecessary razor wire around the site should be removed. (2.14)

Staff-prisoner relationships

5.25 Prisoner Forums should be held regularly across the prison. (2.21)

Equality and diversity

5.26 All staff should receive diversity training. (2.29)

5.27 Prisoner Forums should be introduced to identify and address the negative perceptions of some diverse groups. (2.39)

5.28 The needs of all diverse groups, including foreign nationals, prisoners with disabilities and older prisoners should be identified on reception and effectively addressed. (2.40)

5.29 Arrangements for prisoners with disabilities to be supported by other prisoners should be formalised to ensure proper supervision by staff. (2.41)

5.30 All aspects of diversity should be promoted. (2.42)

Faith and religious activity

5.31 A dedicated space for prisoners to worship should be permanently available. (2.50)

Legal rights

5.32 Prisoners should be able to refer to up-to-date legal books and publications in the library. (2.61)

Health services

5.33 Staffing arrangements and management should be sufficient to ensure consistently good outcomes for prisoners. (2.77)

5.34 Data should be used effectively to drive up standards of care. (2.78)

5.35 An induction programme and clinical supervision should be provided for all staff. (2.79)

5.36 Resuscitation equipment should be effectively organised and checked, and oxygen cylinders in the emergency van should be secured. (2.80)

5.37 The management of complaints should be improved. (2.81)

5.38 The quality of recording on EMIS should be improved with regular audits of health care records. (2.95)

5.39 Chronic disease management should be progressed by the multi-disciplinary team and care should be provided by staff with the relevant skills and competency. (2.96)

5.40 Individual risk assessments regarding cuffing arrangements should be carried out with the involvement of health care staff for prisoners attending external hospital appointments. (2.97)

5.41 Prisoners should have access to barrier protection. (2.98)

5.42 In-possession monitoring checks and risk assessment reviews should be carried out in accordance with Trust policy. (2.109)

5.43 Controlled drug audits should be carried out each quarter and records maintained of all stock medications. Unused medications should be appropriately disposed of. (2.110)

- 5.44 'Supervised swallow' administration should be carried out to Nursing and Midwifery Council standards. (2.111)
- 5.45 In-possession medication should be supplied to prisoners from a room other than the treatment room. (2.113)
- 5.46 Dental practice should comply with HTM 01-05. (2.117)
- 5.47 More group work activities should be provided to meet the needs of prisoners with mental health issues. (2.121)

Catering

- 5.48 Food comment books should be provided on wings and comments should be responded to by catering staff. (2.126)

Purchases

- 5.49 Prisoners should be able to receive shop items within 24 hours of arrival. (2.132)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.50 The leadership and management of the learning and skills provision should be improved. (3.10)
- 5.51 More effective procedures should be developed for self-evaluation and quality improvement planning, including the improved use of data to review and monitor the quality and impact of the provision. (3.11)
- 5.52 A more progressive, broader curriculum should be provided to ensure that prisoners have enough opportunity to achieve accredited qualifications at the appropriate level recognised by employers. (3.16)
- 5.53 Health and safety practices in Foyleview should be reviewed and changes made as necessary to minimise risk. (3.23)
- 5.54 Links between the essential skills and vocational training programmes should be improved to enhance prisoners' progression and employment opportunities. (3.26)
- 5.55 Prisoners should have access to the library at weekends and facilities in Foyleview should be upgraded. (3.30)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.56 The overall strategic development of physical education should be reviewed and the number of prisoners who regularly participate in such activities should be increased. (3.37)
- 5.57 Outdoor facilities, including a suitable all-weather outdoor surface, should be provided. (3.38)
- 5.58 A full risk assessment of the fitness equipment on the wings should be undertaken. (3.39)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.59 The rationale for home leave decisions should be carefully recorded. (4.6)

Offender management and planning

- 5.60 All prisoners should receive ongoing planned contact from their case/sentence managers which is proportionate to their risk and need. (4.14)
- 5.61 All staff should understand public protection procedures and their responsibilities to protect the public from harm. (4.18)

Re-integration planning

- 5.62 Accommodation outcomes should be monitored and the information should be used to inform and develop housing services. (4.32)
- 5.63 Links with employers should be improved to enhance prisoners' preparation for release and resettlement. (4.36)
- 5.64 Effective, high quality careers advice and guidance should be introduced. (4.37)
- 5.65 Closed visits should not be imposed automatically on a dog indication. (4.52)
- 5.66 Vulnerable prisoners' concerns about the safety of their families while visiting should be investigated and resolved. (4.53)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

- 5.67 The information booklet should provide up-to-date, accurate information. (1.18)

Health services

- 5.68 Staff should wear name badges. (2.82)
- 5.69 Health care rooms in Halward House should be brought up to the required standard. (2.83)
- 5.70 The medicine trolley should be secured to the wall in the CSU when not in use, and recorded safety checks should be undertaken on defibrillators by NIPS staff. (2.84)
- 5.71 Health care staff should provide sufficient explanation to prisoners about their medication. (2.85)
- 5.72 Recruitment for forensic occupational therapy vacancies should commence. (2.86)
- 5.73 Health care request forms should be dated. (2.99)
- 5.74 All staff should receive training in read codes. (2.100)
- 5.75 All medicine labels should be legible. (2.114)
- 5.76 Prescribing data should be used to demonstrate value for money and to promote effective medicines management. (2.115)

Catering

- 5.77 Servery orderlies should be appropriately dressed. (2.127)

Purchases

- 5.78 Prisoners should be formally consulted about the product list. (2.133)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.79 The library management software issue should be addressed. (3.31)

Example of good practice

Discipline

- 5.80 The recording of adjudication hearings added to the transparency of the process and provided additional reassurance about fairness. (1.63)



Copyright© Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland
All rights reserved

First published in Northern Ireland in February 2015 by
CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSPECTION NORTHERN IRELAND
Block 1, Knockview Buildings
Belfast BT4 3SJ
www.cjini.org



Report on an unannounced inspection of

Magilligan Prison

APPENDICIES

Appendix I	Inspection Team
Appendix II	Prison Population Profile
Appendix III	Summary of Prisoner Questionnaires and Interviews
Appendix IV	Prisoner Survey Responses



Appendix I: Inspection team

Brendan McGuigan
Nick Hardwick

Chief Inspector, Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland
Chief Inspector of Prisons

Sean Sullivan
Dr. Ian Cameron
Paul Fenning
Ian MacFadyen
Jeanette Hall
Gordon Riach
Gary Boughen
Paul Roberts

Team leader
Inspector, Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland
Inspector, HMIP
Inspector, HMIP
Inspector, HMIP
Inspector, HMIP
Inspector, HMIP
Inspector, HMIP

Rachel Prime
Gemma Quayle
Joe Simmonds

Researcher
Researcher
Researcher

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:

Status	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced		568	100.00
Recall			
Convicted unsentenced			
Remand			
Civil prisoners			
Detainees			
Total		568	100.00

Status type	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Adult Determinate Custodial Sentence		331	58.27
Adult sentenced		164	28.87
Adult Extended Custodial Sentence		39	6.87
Adult Appellant		22	3.87
Adult Lifer		6	1.06
Adult Indeterminate Custodial Sentence		4	0.70
Young Offender Determinate Custodial Sentence		2	0.35
Total		568	100.00

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced			
Less than six months		14	2.46
six months to less than 12 months		61	10.74
12 months to less than 2 years		69	12.15
2 years to less than 4 years		180	31.69
4 years to less than 10 years		169	29.75
10 years and over (not life)		69	12.15
Life / Indeterminate		6	1.06
Total		568	100.00

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here:		
Under 21 years		
21 years to 29 years	213	37.50
30 years to 39 years	148	26.06
40 years to 49 years	104	18.31
50 years to 59 years	63	11.09
60 years to 69 years	28	4.93
70 plus years	12	2.11
Please state maximum age here:	85	
Total	568	100.00

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Northern Irish		406	71.48
British		68	11.97
Irish		61	10.74
Foreign National		18	3.17
British English		12	2.11
British Scotland		3	0.53
Total		568	100.00

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced			
Uncategorised sentenced			
Category A			
Category B		131	23.06
Category C		392	69.01
Category D		45	7.92
Other			
Total		568	100.00

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White		550	96.83
Other Ethnic Group		5	0.68
Irish Traveller		4	0.70
Mixed Ethnic Group		2	0.35
Bangladeshi		1	0.18
Chinese		3	0.53
Black African		1	0.18
Black Other		2	0.35
Total		568	100.00

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Church of England		3	0.53
Roman Catholic		295	51.94
Presbyterian		101	17.78
Church of Ireland		62	10.92
Methodist		15	2.64
Free Prebyterian		25	4.40
Christian		5	0.88
Muslim		5	0.88
Brethren		2	0.35
Christian Fellowship Church		1	0.18
Church of Scotland		1	0.18
Elim		1	0.18
Evangelical		1	0.18
Hindu		1	0.18
Pagan		1	0.18
Jewish		1	0.18
Pentecostal		1	0.18
Reformed Presbyterian		1	0.18
Other		3	0.53
No religion		43	7.57
Total		568	100.00

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month			23	
1 month to 3 months			73	
3 months to six months			71	
six months to 1 year			133	
1 year to 2 years			117	
2 years to 4 years			101	
4 years or more			50	
Total			568	100.00

Home address

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
0-20 miles		18	3.17
21-50 miles		94	16.55
Over 50		371	65.32
Maghaberry prison address		21	3.70
Magilligan prison address		16	2.82
No Fixed Abode		26	4.58
Postcode Not Verified		22	3.87
Total		568	100.00

Main offence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person			
Sexual offences		132	23.24
Burglary/ Robbery /Theft		122	21.48
Other Offences against the person		121	21.30
Murder		13	2.29
Motoring Offences		29	5.11
Fraud and forgery		3	0.53
Drugs offences		49	8.63
Other offences		84	14.79
Offences against the state		5	0.88
Criminal Damage		10	1.76
Total		568	100.00

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.

Sampling

The prisoner survey was conducted on a representative sample of the prison population. Using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician we calculated the sample size required to ensure that our survey findings reflected the experiences of the entire population of the establishment¹. Respondents were then randomly selected from a prisoner population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. We also ensured that the proportion of black and minority ethnic prisoners in the sample reflected the proportion in the prison as a whole.

Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

Survey response

At the time of the survey on 27 May 2014 the prisoner population at Magilligan Prison was 558. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 185 prisoners.

We received a total of 157 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 85%. This included three questionnaires completed via interview. Twelve respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, nine questionnaires were not returned and seven were returned blank.

¹ 95% confidence interval with a sampling error of 3%. The formula assumes an 80% response rate (70% in open establishments) and we routinely 'oversample' to ensure we achieve the minimum number of responses required.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
Houseblock 1	27
Houseblock 2	26
Houseblock 3	25
Sperrin	18
Alpha	16
Foyleview	22
Halward House	21
Care and separation unit	2

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for Magilligan Prison.

First a full breakdown of responses is provided for each question. In this full breakdown all percentages, including those for filtered questions, refer to the full sample. Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant² differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in prisoners' background details.

Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation of how the filter has been applied. Percentages for filtered questions refer to the number of respondents filtered to that question. For all other questions, percentages refer to the entire sample. All missing responses have been excluded from analyses.

Percentages shown in the full breakdown may differ slightly from those shown in the comparative analyses. This is because the data have been weighted to enable valid statistical comparison between establishments.

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from Magilligan Prison in 2014 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other Category C training prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 41 Category C training prisons since April 2008.
- The current survey responses from Magilligan Prison in 2014 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at Magilligan Prison in 2010.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of Catholic and Protestant prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the vulnerable prisoner wing (Sperrin) and the rest of the establishment, excluding the care and separation unit.

² A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.05 which means that there is only a 5% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

Survey summary

Section I: 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.

Q1.1	What wing or houseblock are you currently living on? See shortened methodology	
Q1.2	How old are you?	
	<i>Under 21</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	56 (36%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	44 (28%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	28 (18%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	16 (10%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	3 (2%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?	
	<i>Yes</i>	147 (94%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	18 (12%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	28 (18%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	33 (22%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	42 (27%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>ICS/ ECS</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Life</i>	6 (4%)
Q1.5	Do you hold UK citizenship?	
	<i>Yes</i>	148 (97%)
	<i>No</i>	5 (3%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	151 (99%)
	<i>No</i>	2 (1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	153 (99%)
	<i>No</i>	2 (1%)

Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	White - British	75 (49%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese..... 1 (1%)
	White - Irish.....	72 (47%)	Asian or Asian British - other
	White - other.....	3 (2%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean 1 (1%)
	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
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	0 (0%)	Arab
	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		2 (1%)
	No.....		144 (99%)
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	None.....	11 (7%)	Buddhist..... 0 (0%)
	Church of Ireland.....	11 (7%)	Hindu..... 0 (0%)
	Catholic	75 (50%)	Jewish..... 0 (0%)
	Protestant.....	41 (27%)	Muslim..... 0 (0%)
	Presbyterian	2 (1%)	Sikh
	Methodist.....	2 (1%)	Other
	Other Christian denomination	6 (4%)	3 (2%)
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	Heterosexual/ Straight		149 (98%)
	Homosexual/Gay.....		2 (1%)
	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		34 (22%)
	No.....		120 (78%)
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?		
	Yes		12 (8%)
	No.....		139 (92%)
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	Yes		81 (52%)
	No.....		74 (48%)
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	Yes		80 (53%)
	No.....		71 (47%)

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		57 (37%)
	2 hours or longer		87 (56%)
	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		57 (37%)
	Yes		20 (13%)
	No.....		71 (46%)

	<i>Don't remember</i>	5 (3%)
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	57 (38%)
	<i>Yes</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>No</i>	86 (57%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	5 (3%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	<i>Yes</i>	81 (53%)
	<i>No</i>	65 (42%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (5%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	<i>Yes</i>	106 (69%)
	<i>No</i>	47 (31%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (1%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	<i>Very well</i>	20 (13%)
	<i>Well</i>	65 (42%)
	<i>Neither</i>	47 (31%)
	<i>Badly</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (6%)
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>	116 (75%)
	<i>Yes, I received written information</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>No, I was not told anything</i>	34 (22%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (1%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	<i>Yes</i>	117 (76%)
	<i>No</i>	28 (18%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (6%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	121 (79%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	25 (16%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (5%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	<i>Yes</i>	118 (77%)
	<i>No</i>	30 (19%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (4%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	<i>Very well</i>	36 (23%)
	<i>Well</i>	83 (54%)
	<i>Neither</i>	22 (14%)
	<i>Badly</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	5 (3%)

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>	22 (14%)	<i>Physical health</i> 16 (10%)
	<i>Housing problems</i>	12 (8%)	<i>Mental health</i> 29 (19%)
	<i>Contacting employers</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i> 13 (8%)
	<i>Contacting family</i>	16 (10%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> 17 (11%)
	<i>Childcare</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Other</i>
	<i>Money worries</i>	26 (17%)	<i>Did not have any problems</i> 60 (39%)
	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	21 (14%)	
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?		
	<i>Yes</i>	41 (27%)	
	<i>No</i>	53 (34%)	
	<i>Did not have any problems</i>	60 (39%)	
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Tobacco</i>	61 (40%)	
	<i>A shower</i>	63 (41%)	
	<i>A free telephone call</i>	39 (25%)	
	<i>Something to eat</i>	113 (73%)	
	<i>PIN phone credit</i>	66 (43%)	
	<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i>	71 (46%)	
	<i>Did not receive anything</i>	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.)		
	<i>Chaplain</i>	70 (46%)	
	<i>Someone from health services</i>	98 (65%)	
	<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>	68 (45%)	
	<i>Tuck shop/ canteen</i>	95 (63%)	
	<i>Did not have access to any of these</i>	15 (10%)	
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>What was going to happen to you</i>	90 (62%)	
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	58 (40%)	
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>	70 (48%)	
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>	68 (47%)	
	<i>Health services</i>	89 (61%)	
	<i>Chaplaincy</i>	67 (46%)	
	<i>Not offered any information</i>	23 (16%)	
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?		
	<i>Yes</i>	116 (76%)	
	<i>No</i>	30 (20%)	
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (5%)	
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?		
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	14 (9%)	
	<i>Within the first week</i>	98 (65%)	
	<i>More than a week</i>	31 (21%)	
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (5%)	
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?		
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	14 (9%)	

Yes	80 (54%)
No.....	42 (28%)
Don't remember	12 (8%)

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

Did not receive an assessment.....	8 (6%)
Within the first week.....	36 (25%)
More than a week.....	79 (54%)
Don't remember	22 (15%)

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?	35 (23%)	65 (44%)	16 (11%)	9 (6%)	6 (4%)	18 (12%)
Attend legal visits?	27 (20%)	57 (41%)	19 (14%)	8 (6%)	2 (1%)	25 (18%)
Get bail information?	14 (11%)	18 (14%)	20 (16%)	11 (9%)	6 (5%)	56 (45%)

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.....	39 (26%)
Yes	64 (43%)
No.....	46 (31%)

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

Yes.....	28 (19%)
No.....	21 (14%)
Don't know	102 (68%)

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 (97%)	3 (2%)	1 (1%)
Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	146 (97%)	4 (3%)	0 (0%)
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	139 (93%)	10 (7%)	0 (0%)
Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	115 (78%)	31 (21%)	2 (1%)
Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	65 (45%)	43 (30%)	36 (25%)
Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	113 (75%)	37 (25%)	0 (0%)
If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	75 (51%)	28 (19%)	45 (30%)

Q4.5 What is the food like here?

Very good.....	11 (7%)
Good.....	72 (47%)
Neither	44 (29%)
Bad	19 (13%)
Very bad.....	6 (4%)

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.....	106 (70%)
No.....	45 (30%)

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

Yes	105 (70%)
No.....	7 (5%)
Don't know	37 (25%)

Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	102 (69%)
	No.....	18 (12%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	27 (18%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	104 (69%)
	No.....	9 (6%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	38 (25%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	34 (23%)
	Very easy.....	41 (28%)
	Easy.....	54 (36%)
	Neither.....	6 (4%)
	Difficult.....	2 (1%)
	Very difficult.....	2 (1%)
	Don't know.....	10 (7%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	107 (73%)
	No	10 (7%)
	Don't know.....	29 (20%)
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications (<i>If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option</i>)	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	47 (33%) 55 (39%) 39 (28%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	47 (37%) 49 (38%) 32 (25%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	96 (69%)
	No	12 (9%)
	Don't know.....	32 (23%)
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints (<i>If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.</i>)	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	61 (42%) 32 (22%) 51 (35%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	61 (46%) 39 (30%) 32 (24%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	
	Yes	32 (23%)
	No.....	105 (77%)
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	72 (51%)
	Very easy.....	13 (9%)
	Easy.....	21 (15%)
	Neither.....	23 (16%)
	Difficult.....	10 (7%)
	Very difficult.....	3 (2%)

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)	
	<i>Don't know what the PREP scheme is</i>	7 (5%)
	Yes	93 (65%)
	No	33 (23%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	10 (7%)
Q6.2	Do the different levels of the PREP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)	
	<i>Don't know what the PREP scheme is</i>	7 (5%)
	Yes	74 (53%)
	No.....	47 (34%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	12 (9%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	Yes	16 (11%)
	No.....	134 (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>I have not been to the SSU in the last 6 months</i>	95 (67%)
	Very well.....	8 (6%)
	Well.....	11 (8%)
	Neither	8 (6%)
	Badly.....	11 (8%)
	Very badly	8 (6%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	122 (82%)
	No.....	26 (18%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	107 (73%)
	No.....	39 (27%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	41 (28%)
	No.....	108 (72%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	9 (6%)
	Never.....	19 (13%)
	Rarely	31 (21%)
	Some of the time	44 (30%)
	Most of the time.....	32 (21%)
	All of the time.....	14 (9%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	31 (21%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	38 (26%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	52 (35%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	26 (18%)

Q7.6 How helpful is your personal (named) officer?

<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	31 (22%)
<i>Very helpful</i>	29 (21%)
<i>Helpful</i>	39 (28%)
<i>Neither</i>	22 (16%)
<i>Not very helpful</i>	11 (8%)
<i>Not at all helpful</i>	6 (4%)

Section 8: Safety**Q8.1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?**

<i>Yes</i>	65 (43%)
<i>No</i>	86 (57%)

Q8.2 Do you feel unsafe now?

<i>Yes</i>	18 (12%)
<i>No</i>	129 (88%)

Q8.3 In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	86 (61%)	<i>At meal times</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Everywhere</i>	7 (5%)	<i>At health services</i>	15 (11%)
<i>SSU</i>	13 (9%)	<i>Visits area</i>	18 (13%)
<i>Association areas</i>	7 (5%)	<i>In wing showers</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Reception area</i>	6 (4%)	<i>In gym showers</i>	6 (4%)
<i>At the gym</i>	8 (6%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	0 (0%)
<i>In an exercise yard</i>	4 (3%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	6 (4%)
<i>At work</i>	9 (6%)	<i>In your cell</i>	4 (3%)
<i>During movement</i>	22 (16%)	<i>At religious services</i>	4 (3%)
<i>At education</i>	6 (4%)		

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

<i>Yes</i>	45 (30%)
<i>No</i>	104 (70%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	21 (14%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	10 (7%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	25 (17%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Medication</i>	6 (4%)
<i>Debt</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Drugs</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	7 (5%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	3 (2%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your age</i>	2 (1%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	3 (2%)
<i>You were new here</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	17 (11%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	4 (3%)

Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	55 (37%)
	No.....	93 (63%)
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)	21 (14%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....	3 (2%)
	Sexual abuse	0 (0%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated	20 (14%)
	Medication.....	6 (4%)
	Debt	2 (1%)
	Drugs.....	6 (4%)
	Your race or ethnic origin.....	3 (2%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs	16 (11%)
	Your nationality	9 (6%)
	You are from a different part of the country than others.....	5 (3%)
	You are from a traveller community	4 (3%)
	Your sexual orientation	4 (3%)
	Your age.....	3 (2%)
	You have a disability.....	4 (3%)
	You were new here.....	5 (3%)
	Your offence/ crime	16 (11%)
	Gang related issues.....	4 (3%)
Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	Not been victimised	77 (55%)
	Yes	18 (13%)
	No.....	46 (33%)

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	20 (13%)	14 (9%)	42 (28%)	19 (13%)	36 (24%)	18 (12%)
	The nurse	14 (10%)	28 (19%)	72 (49%)	16 (11%)	13 (9%)	3 (2%)
	The dentist	22 (15%)	18 (12%)	41 (28%)	19 (13%)	29 (20%)	19 (13%)
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	23 (15%)	15 (10%)	41 (28%)	15 (10%)	33 (22%)	22 (15%)
	The nurse	12 (8%)	37 (26%)	65 (45%)	15 (10%)	10 (7%)	4 (3%)
	The dentist	28 (19%)	44 (31%)	39 (27%)	16 (11%)	10 (7%)	7 (5%)
Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
	Not been					8 (5%)	
	Very good.....					18 (12%)	
	Good.....					51 (34%)	
	Neither					30 (20%)	
	Bad					28 (19%)	
	Very bad.....					13 (9%)	
Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
	Yes					95 (63%)	
	No.....					56 (37%)	
Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?						
	Not taking medication.....					56 (37%)	

Yes, all my meds	63 (42%)
Yes, some of my meds	21 (14%)
No.....	11 (7%)

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

Yes	49 (33%)
No.....	100 (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.....	100 (68%)
Yes	26 (18%)
No.....	20 (14%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol**Q10.1 Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?**

Yes	18 (12%)
No.....	128 (88%)

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

Yes	36 (25%)
No.....	110 (75%)

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

Very easy.....	44 (31%)
Easy.....	14 (10%)
Neither	13 (9%)
Difficult.....	8 (6%)
Very difficult.....	6 (4%)
Don't know	59 (41%)

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

Very easy.....	5 (3%)
Easy.....	9 (6%)
Neither	20 (14%)
Difficult.....	13 (9%)
Very difficult.....	23 (16%)
Don't know	75 (52%)

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

Yes	18 (12%)
No.....	130 (88%)

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

Yes	15 (10%)
No.....	132 (90%)

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

Did not / do not have a drug problem	112 (77%)
Yes	19 (13%)
No.....	14 (10%)

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

Did not / do not have an alcohol problem.....	110 (76%)
---	-----------

Yes	25 (17%)
No.....	10 (7%)

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

<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	110 (76%)
Yes	27 (19%)
No.....	7 (5%)

Section II: 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	20 (14%)	18 (12%)	51 (35%)	23 (16%)	23 (16%)	11 (8%)
Vocational or skills training	24 (17%)	16 (12%)	47 (34%)	24 (17%)	15 (11%)	13 (9%)
Education (including basic skills)	14 (10%)	23 (17%)	64 (46%)	18 (13%)	12 (9%)	8 (6%)
Offending behaviour programmes	41 (30%)	15 (11%)	38 (28%)	15 (11%)	12 (9%)	14 (10%)

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

<i>Not involved in any of these</i>	40 (28%)
Prison job.....	75 (52%)
Vocational or skills training.....	24 (17%)
Education (including basic skills).....	41 (29%)
Offending behaviour programmes	12 (8%)

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?

	<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Prison job	29 (23%)	56 (44%)	32 (25%)	9 (7%)
Vocational or skills training	31 (31%)	39 (39%)	24 (24%)	6 (6%)
Education (including basic skills)	25 (22%)	62 (54%)	24 (21%)	4 (3%)
Offending behaviour programmes	37 (39%)	28 (29%)	22 (23%)	8 (8%)

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	19 (13%)
<i>Never</i>	38 (26%)
<i>Less than once a week</i>	24 (16%)
<i>About once a week</i>	61 (42%)
<i>More than once a week</i>	4 (3%)

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

<i>Don't use it</i>	51 (35%)
Yes.....	57 (40%)
No.....	36 (25%)

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	34 (24%)
0.....	22 (15%)
1 to 2	43 (30%)
3 to 5	42 (29%)
<i>More than 5</i>	3 (2%)

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	6 (4%)
0.....	15 (10%)
1 to 2	38 (26%)

3 to 5	45 (31%)
More than 5	40 (28%)

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

Don't want to go	8 (6%)
0	9 (6%)
1 to 2	13 (9%)
3 to 5	15 (10%)
More than 5	98 (69%)

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	3 (2%)
2 to less than 4 hours	13 (9%)
4 to less than 6 hours	31 (21%)
6 to less than 8 hours	29 (20%)
8 to less than 10 hours	27 (18%)
10 hours or more	33 (23%)
Don't know	10 (7%)

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	65 (47%)
No	73 (53%)

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

Yes	59 (41%)
No	86 (59%)

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

Yes	25 (17%)
No	119 (83%)

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

I don't get visits	11 (8%)
Very easy	13 (9%)
Easy	28 (20%)
Neither	10 (7%)
Difficult	34 (24%)
Very difficult	45 (32%)
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?**

Not sentenced	0 (0%)
Yes	99 (70%)
No	43 (30%)

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

Not sentenced/ NA	43 (31%)
No contact	27 (20%)
Letter	5 (4%)
Phone	1 (1%)
Visit	63 (46%)

Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?			
	Yes	105	(75%)	
	No.....	35	(25%)	
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?			
	Not sentenced	0	(0%)	
	Yes	118	(83%)	
	No.....	24	(17%)	
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?			
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	24	(17%)	
	Very involved.....	33	(23%)	
	Involved	42	(30%)	
	Neither	7	(5%)	
	Not very involved	20	(14%)	
	Not at all involved.....	15	(11%)	
Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets?			
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	24	(17%)	
	Nobody.....	31	(22%)	
	Offender supervisor	22	(16%)	
	Offender manager	47	(33%)	
	Named/ personal officer	34	(24%)	
	Staff from other departments	17	(12%)	
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?			
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	24	(17%)	
	Yes	82	(59%)	
	No.....	13	(9%)	
	Don't know	20	(14%)	
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.....	24	(17%)	
	Yes	20	(14%)	
	No.....	71	(51%)	
	Don't know	24	(17%)	
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.....	24	(17%)	
	Yes	44	(31%)	
	No.....	35	(25%)	
	Don't know	38	(27%)	
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?			
	Yes	17	(12%)	
	No.....	59	(42%)	
	Don't know	66	(46%)	
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?			
	Yes	27	(20%)	
	No.....	111	(80%)	
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>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
	Employment	44 (33%)	36 (27%)	53 (40%)
	Accommodation	44 (34%)	39 (30%)	46 (36%)

Benefits	36 (27%)	52 (39%)	44 (33%)
Finances	41 (32%)	28 (22%)	59 (46%)
Education	36 (29%)	37 (30%)	50 (41%)
Drugs and alcohol	51 (40%)	42 (33%)	34 (27%)

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?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
Yes	78 (59%)
No.....	55 (41%)



Prisoner survey responses: Magilligan Prison 2014

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

		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		75	41
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	3%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	9%	3%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	10%	25%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (ICS/ECS prisoner)?	7%	3%
1.5	Do you hold UK citizenship?	95%	100%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	0%	0%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	0%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	29%	15%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	41%	56%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	60%	50%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	64%	54%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	68%	63%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	49%	56%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	80%	63%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	73%	75%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	75%	83%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	73%	78%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	73%	81%
When you first arrived:			
3.4	Did you have any problems?	62%	61%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	19%	15%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	8%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	0%

Key to tables

		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		
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	11%	5%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2%	5%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	15%	22%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	12%	15%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	12%	5%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	23%	15%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	8%	5%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	12%	12%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	34%	54%
3.6	A shower?	45%	34%
3.6	A free telephone call?	29%	25%
3.6	Something to eat?	77%	73%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	41%	49%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	47%	51%
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?	35%	59%
3.7	Someone from health services?	58%	71%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	48%	51%
3.7	Tuck shop/ canteen?	61%	66%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	60%	62%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	40%	38%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	49%	44%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	47%	44%
3.8	Health services?	61%	57%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	44%	49%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	79%	73%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	90%	92%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	92%	95%
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?	74%	58%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	70%	56%
4.1	Get bail information?	27%	23%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	47%	37%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	19%	18%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		

Key to tables

		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		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	94%	100%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94%	100%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	91%	90%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	76%	66%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	40%	64%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	77%	72%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	47%	54%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	50%	59%
4.6	Does the tuck shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	63%	78%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	62%	82%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	71%	68%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	64%	73%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	72%	71%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	69%	73%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	66%	70%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	35%	12%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	25%	28%
SECTION 6: Progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the PREP scheme?	60%	65%
6.2	Do the different levels of the PREP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	48%	55%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	17%	3%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	81%	82%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	74%	71%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	27%	22%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	30%	34%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	82%	82%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	36%	46%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	13%	10%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	19%	35%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	6%	13%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	8%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	6%	30%

Key to tables

		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		
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	10%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	15%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	8%
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	41%	27%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	14%	8%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	0%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	15%	15%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	5%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	12%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	9%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	6%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	3%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	9%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	3%
SECTION 9: Health services			

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	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		
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	37%	40%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	69%	70%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	43%	32%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	58%	63%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	35%	37%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	17%	12%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	26%	30%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	40%	39%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	12%	10%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	16%	15%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	12%	15%
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	43%	51%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	41%	58%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	57%	78%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	37%	38%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	52%	54%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	16%	19%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	20%	39%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	11%	8%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	52%	32%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	46%	27%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	38%	33%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	72%	49%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	75%	69%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	27%	15%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	42%	54%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	46%	40%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	17%	23%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	37%	20%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	73%	83%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	9%	13%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	17%	27%



Diversity Analysis

Key question responses (disability and aged over 50) Magilligan Prison

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	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					
Number of completed questionnaires returned		34	120	26	130
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Do you hold UK citizenship?	98%	91%	96%	100%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	99%	100%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	99%	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	0%	3%	5%	2%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	1%	5%	1%
1.10	Are you Catholic?	65%	46%	21%	56%
1.10	Are you Protestant?	18%	29%	17%	29%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	-	-	24%	22%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%	9%	29%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	47%	54%	72%	48%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	47%	58%	64%	54%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	56%	81%	76%	75%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	70%	79%	88%	74%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	74%	78%	81%	76%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	85%	53%	48%	63%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	51%	69%	70%	64%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	55%	82%	61%	79%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	90%	91%	84%	92%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	84%	64%	68%	68%
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	94%	98%	100%	97%

Diversity Analysis

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				
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	97%	96%	98%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	40%	48%	52%	43%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	34%	60%	56%	54%
4.6	Does the tuck shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	68%	71%	75%	70%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	68%	70%	80%	68%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	66%	71%	87%	66%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	68%	69%	80%	66%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	77%	71%	76%	73%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	79%	67%	68%	68%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the PREP scheme?	66%	65%	80%	62%
6.2	Do the different levels of the PREP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	34%	57%	58%	51%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	28%	6%	5%	12%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	75%	85%	92%	80%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	78%	72%	84%	71%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	21%	34%	32%	31%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	75%	81%	72%	80%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	70%	35%	48%	42%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	19%	11%	13%	12%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	53%	23%	36%	29%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	28%	12%	20%	16%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	4%	5%	0%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	4%	5%	5%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	4%	0%	0%	2%

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				
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	10%	0%	5%	2%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	56%	32%	28%	39%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	25%	10%	12%	14%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	6%	1%	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	12%	10%	0%	13%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	6%	6%	5%	7%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	6%	0%	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	12%	0%	8%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	43%	35%	44%	37%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	77%	66%	72%	68%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	94%	54%	72%	61%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	75%	21%	20%	36%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	34%	42%	32%	43%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	59%	49%	52%	53%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	22%	15%	16%	16%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	34%	26%	36%	27%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	10%	8%	5%	9%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	59%	40%	48%	43%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	26%	33%	8%	35%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	55%	60%	60%	59%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	78%	66%	48%	73%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	22%	23%	36%	20%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	36%	42%	28%	43%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	13%	18%	5%	20%

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses: Magilligan Prison 2014

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

		Magilligan Prison 2014	Cat C Trainer prisons comparator	Magilligan Prison 2014	Magilligan Prison 2010
	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		157	6765	157	164
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	1%	3%	1%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	7%	10%	7%	1%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	17%	6%	17%	21%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence (ICS/ECS prisoner)?	4%	9%	4%	0%
1.5	Do you hold UK citizenship?	97%	90%	97%	88%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	99%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	98%	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)	2%	28%	2%	3%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	1%	4%	1%	4%
1.10	Are you Catholic?	50%	18%	50%	43%
1.10	Are you Protestant?	27%	1%	27%	24%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	3%	2%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	22%	18%	22%	21%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	8%	6%	8%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	52%	38%	52%	46%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	53%	52%	53%	56%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	57%	46%	57%	39%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	21%	73%	21%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	3%	8%	3%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	53%	65%	53%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	69%	80%	69%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	55%	70%	55%	53%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	75%	60%	75%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	3%	18%	3%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	76%	89%	76%	81%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	79%	51%	79%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	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	Magilligan Prison 2014	Cat C Trainer prisons comparator	Magilligan Prison 2014	Magilligan Prison 2010
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?				77%	84%	77%	78%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?				77%	73%	77%	73%
When you first arrived:								
3.4	Did you have any problems?				61%	61%	61%	51%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?				14%	17%	14%	15%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?				8%	15%	8%	15%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?				1%	3%	1%	6%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?				11%	21%	11%	12%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?				2%	2%	2%	4%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?				17%	15%	17%	7%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?				14%	13%	14%	18%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?				11%	12%	11%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?				19%	13%	19%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?				9%	4%	9%	13%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?				11%	18%	11%	8%
For those with problems:								
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?				44%	36%	44%	
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:								
3.6	Tobacco?				40%	75%	40%	61%
3.6	A shower?				41%	29%	41%	48%
3.6	A free telephone call?				25%	42%	25%	38%
3.6	Something to eat?				73%	62%	73%	85%
3.6	PIN phone credit?				43%	50%	43%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?				46%	45%	46%	
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?				46%	51%	46%	
3.7	Someone from health services?				65%	69%	65%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?				45%	32%	45%	
3.7	Tuck shop/ canteen?				63%	21%	63%	70%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:								
3.8	What was going to happen to you?				62%	51%	62%	51%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?				40%	42%	40%	49%
3.8	How to make routine requests?				48%	45%	48%	58%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?				47%	44%	47%	57%
3.8	Health services?				61%	54%	61%	66%
3.8	The chaplaincy?				46%	49%	46%	52%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?				76%	82%	76%	77%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		Magilligan Prison 2014	Cat C Trainer prisons comparator	Magilligan Prison 2014	Magilligan Prison 2010
	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				
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	91%	91%	91%	95%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	60%	62%	60%	74%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	95%	83%	95%	
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?	67%	48%	67%	65%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	61%	51%	61%	64%
4.1	Get bail information?	26%	14%	26%	22%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	43%	41%	43%	40%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	19%	43%	19%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	97%	67%	97%	90%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	92%	97%	98%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	93%	78%	93%	96%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	78%	70%	78%	85%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	45%	37%	45%	54%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	75%	68%	75%	72%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	51%	26%	51%	65%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	55%	26%	55%	51%
4.6	Does the tuck shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	70%	45%	70%	53%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	71%	56%	71%	74%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	69%	53%	69%	74%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	69%	59%	69%	75%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	64%	50%	64%	
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	73%	82%	73%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	59%	60%	59%	65%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	60%	47%	60%	74%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	69%	60%	69%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	39%	33%	39%	25%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	55%	34%	55%	58%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	23%	18%	23%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	24%	29%	24%	21%
SECTION 6: Progressive regimes and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the PREP scheme?	65%	53%	65%	55%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		Magilligan Prison 2014	Cat C Trainer prisons comparator	Magilligan Prison 2014	Magilligan Prison 2010
	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				
6.2	Do the different levels of the PREP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	53%	47%	53%	47%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	11%	6%	11%	4%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation and separation unit (SSU), were you treated very well/ well by staff?	41%	40%	41%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	83%	76%	83%	83%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	73%	74%	73%	75%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	28%	29%	28%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	31%	20%	31%	30%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	79%	71%	79%	53%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	64%	63%	64%	72%
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	43%	33%	43%	40%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	12%	14%	12%	12%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	30%	24%	30%	26%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	14%	10%	14%	9%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	7%	6%	7%	6%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	3%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	17%	15%	17%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	5%	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	4%	4%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	3%	3%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	3%	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	3%	1%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	3%	5%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	2%	5%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	4%	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	4%	3%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	11%	4%	11%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	4%	3%	4%
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	37%	28%	37%	27%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		Magilligan Prison 2014	Cat C Trainer prisons comparator	Magilligan Prison 2014	Magilligan Prison 2010
	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				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	14%	10%	14%	10%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	3%	2%	4%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	12%	14%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	4%	4%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	2%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	3%	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	4%	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	11%	3%	11%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	6%	3%	6%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	3%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	3%	1%	3%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	1%	3%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	2%	3%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	5%	3%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	11%	4%	11%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	2%	3%	1%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	28%	39%	28%	42%
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	38%	32%	38%	61%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	69%	55%	69%	89%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	40%	13%	40%	56%
	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?	44%	47%	44%	49%
9.2	The nurse?	78%	59%	78%	81%
9.2	The dentist?	72%	42%	72%	78%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	49%	43%	49%	68%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	63%	47%	63%	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?	88%	84%	88%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	33%	27%	33%	34%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	56%	49%	56%	
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	12%	23%	12%	31%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Magilligan Prison 2014	Cat C Trainer prisons comparator	Magilligan Prison 2014	Magilligan Prison 2010
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
10.2 Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	25%	17%	25%	28%
10.3 Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	40%	32%	40%	40%
10.4 Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	10%	20%	10%	
10.5 Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	12%	8%	12%	11%
10.6 Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	10%	6%	10%	
For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7 Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	57%	63%	57%	
10.8 Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	71%	63%	71%	
For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9 Was the support helpful?	79%	79%	79%	79%
SECTION 11: Activities				
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1 A prison job?	47%	42%	47%	
11.1 Vocational or skills training?	45%	38%	45%	
11.1 Education (including basic skills)?	63%	53%	63%	
11.1 Offending behaviour programmes?	39%	21%	39%	
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2 A prison job?	53%	59%	53%	71%
11.2 Vocational or skills training?	17%	16%	17%	18%
11.2 Education (including basic skills)?	29%	26%	29%	35%
11.2 Offending behaviour programmes?	9%	13%	9%	18%
11.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	77%	82%	77%	85%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	58%	42%	58%	47%
11.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	69%	73%	69%	65%
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?	56%	57%	56%	62%
11.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	78%	79%	78%	78%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	69%	60%	69%	60%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	61%	71%	61%	64%
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?	48%	52%	48%	61%
11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	45%	47%	45%	27%
11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	40%	45%	40%	
11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	31%	35%	31%	27%
11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	59%	47%	59%	55%
11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	69%	73%	69%	84%
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	23%	16%	23%	20%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		Magilligan Prison 2014	Cat C Trainer prisons comparator	Magilligan Prison 2014	Magilligan Prison 2010
	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 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	47%	35%	47%	46%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	41%	45%	41%	21%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	17%	24%	17%	8%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	29%	26%	29%	
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?	70%	82%	70%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	29%	34%	29%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	5%	37%	5%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	1%	25%	1%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	67%	33%	67%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	75%	68%	75%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	83%	69%	83%	59%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	64%	54%	64%	60%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	27%	48%	27%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	19%	35%	19%	
13.6	Offender manager?	40%	26%	40%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	29%	13%	29%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	15%	16%	15%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	71%	64%	71%	83%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	17%	23%	17%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	38%	29%	38%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	12%	7%	12%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	20%	16%	20%	22%
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?	41%	34%	41%	
13.12	Accommodation?	46%	37%	46%	
13.12	Benefits?	54%	38%	54%	
13.12	Finances?	32%	25%	32%	
13.12	Education?	42%	35%	42%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	55%	44%	55%	
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?	59%	55%	59%	48%



Prisoner survey responses Magilligan Prison: Vulnerable prisoner wing comparator

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

		Sperrin wing	All other wings (excluding the CSU)
	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		18	137
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	1%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	6%	7%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	33%	15%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (ICS/ECS prisoner)?	0%	4%
1.5	Do you hold UK citizenship?	94%	97%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	0%	2%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	2%
1.10	Are you Catholic?	11%	55%
1.10	Are you protestant?	39%	25%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	18%	22%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	11%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	78%	49%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	33%	56%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	50%	57%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	67%	69%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	72%	54%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	67%	77%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	83%	75%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Sperrin wing	All other wings (excluding the CSU)
	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 2 hours?	83%	78%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	88%	76%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	89%	76%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	44%	62%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	0%	17%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	6%	8%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	2%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	11%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	2%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	17%	17%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	22%	12%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	6%	11%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	11%	20%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	17%	6%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	17%	11%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	28%	40%
3.6	A shower?	50%	40%
3.6	A free telephone call?	22%	26%
3.6	Something to eat?	61%	75%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	33%	45%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	61%	44%
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?	88%	41%
3.7	Someone from health services?	82%	62%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	53%	44%
3.7	Tuck shop/ canteen?	82%	60%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	67%	60%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Sperrin wing	All other wings (excluding the CSU)
	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		
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	22%	42%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	33%	49%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	44%	46%
3.8	Health services?	67%	60%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	56%	44%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	39%	81%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	88%	91%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	94%	94%
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?	67%	68%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	47%	63%
4.1	Get bail information?	20%	27%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	39%	43%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	21%	18%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	100%	97%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	97%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	100%	93%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	72%	80%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	26%	48%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	50%	79%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	44%	52%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	72%	52%
4.6	Does the tuck shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	78%	69%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	100%	68%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	65%	70%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	83%	68%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	61%	65%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	71%	74%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	65%	70%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Sperrin wing	All other wings (excluding the CSU)
	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		
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	6%	27%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	22%	25%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the PREP scheme?	53%	67%
6.2	Do the different levels of the PREP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	53%	52%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	12%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	94%	81%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	94%	71%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	33%	26%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	33%	31%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	72%	80%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	89%	36%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	12%	13%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	56%	26%
Since you have been here, have other prisoners:			
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	39%	11%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	11%	6%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	39%	12%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	6%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	6%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Sperrin wing	All other wings (excluding the CSU)
	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		
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	11%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	44%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	3%
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	30%	39%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	18%	14%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	15%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	7%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	7%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	7%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	18%	10%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	3%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	22%	40%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	56%	70%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	28%	42%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	61%	63%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	22%	33%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Sperrin wing	All other wings (excluding the CSU)
	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?	0%	13%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	11%	27%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	22%	43%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	0%	11%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	13%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	0%	11%
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	50%	47%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	59%	44%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	68%	62%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	26%	41%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	50%	54%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	22%	16%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	50%	25%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	0%	9%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	44%	45%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	33%	41%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	17%	34%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	28%	63%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	35%	73%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	39%	21%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	63%	45%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	22%	43%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	0%	19%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	11%	31%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	82%	74%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	0%	14%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	11%	21%