



Thematic report by HM Inspectorate of Prisons

Women in prison

A short thematic review

July 2010

Crown copyright 2010

ISBN: 978-1-84099-311-0

Published by:
HM Inspectorate of Prisons
1st Floor Ashley House
2 Monck Street
LONDON
SW1P 2BQ

Contents

Acknowledgements	4
Introduction	5
1. Summary	7
2. Background to the report	13
3. Safety	25
4. Respect	37
5. Purposeful activity	53
6. Resettlement	59
Appendices	67

I.	Methodology
II.	Healthy prison assessments for women's prisons 2003–09
III.	Profile of women surveyed
IV.	Survey results
V.	References

Acknowledgements

Samantha Booth
Senior research officer

Louise Falshaw
Head of research, development and thematic

Michael Loughlin
Women's inspection team leader

Julia Fossi
Senior research officer

Introduction

Much has been written about the specific needs and characteristics of the women's prison population – most notably the Corston report, which strongly advocated the development of alternatives to custody and alternative forms of custody. Currently, over 4,300 women are in prison in England and Wales, almost the same number as there were at the same time last year.

This report draws together the findings of the most recent inspection reports on all 14 current women's prisons in England and Wales, and also compares the findings of women prisoners surveyed during 2006–08 with those surveyed in 2003–05. It therefore provides an overview of the conditions and treatment in women's prisons, and an account of any significant changes in women's perceptions of the prison experience.

Four main themes stand out. The first is that closed women's prisons are now nearly all fulfilling a multiplicity of roles. It is no longer accurate to define them as 'local' or 'training' prisons. That arises from decisions to re-role five women's prisons to accommodate the expanding male prison population, so that there are fewer, often larger and almost always more complex women's prisons. A further important consequence of this is that more women are held further from home, particularly women from the West Midlands. There is no sense of a planned strategic approach to the women's prison estate, which is still subject to changes that respond instead to the needs of men – and in one case without any prior gender impact assessment, as the law now requires.

The second overall pattern is that women fare much better in open or semi-open prisons, which inspection reports consistently assess as safer and more effective than closed prisons. Sadly, the two prisons which were semi-open at the time of their last inspection have since become closed prisons.

Third, it is clear that there have been improvements in most women's prisons. The improvement in the treatment and management of women with substance use problems – a significant proportion of those entering prison – has undoubtedly contributed to the drop in self-inflicted deaths in recent years. In relation to activities, all women's prisons were performing at least reasonably well (it should be noted that women's prisons had not yet been affected by the reduction to the core day). Relationships with staff were good in most prisons, and had improved in some – though two other prisons had suffered deterioration. Health care, and particularly secondary mental health care, has improved, and women themselves report a better service. Since many of the reports were published, routine strip-searching of women has been abandoned.

That said, there remain areas of serious concern. The extent and seriousness of self-harm, particularly in women's local prisons, remains high, sometimes resulting in extreme measures, including the use of force. Three women's prisons were not judged to be sufficiently safe: one had noticeably declined when increased numbers led to the use of a large number of detached duty staff, many of them men. Dormitory accommodation in women's prisons remained highly unsatisfactory, on grounds both of safety and respect. Three prisons were also not performing sufficiently well in resettlement, because services were not sufficiently aligned to the specific needs of women, or of the women who were held. Work with foreign nationals was often underdeveloped, a serious failing given the over-representation of this group within the women's prison population. Many of the issues that affect the prison population generally had a particular resonance for women, given their vulnerability and needs: the lack of sufficient

primary mental health care, the need for more alcohol services, and the lack of custody planning for short-sentenced and remanded women.

Overall, this report records commendable work in most women's prisons, dealing with some extremely vulnerable and sometimes challenging women; though it also shows how quickly prisons can deteriorate unless closely managed and appropriately staffed. However, it will do nothing to allay the underlying concerns about the use of imprisonment, particularly in closed environments, for many women – especially as they are now more likely to be further from home and in larger, multi-functional establishments. In spite of a stated commitment to reduce the women's prison population, it remains obstinately static, at the same level as a year ago. Work is certainly needed to improve the prisons we inspect; but even more work is needed to create and properly use viable and more appropriate alternatives to prison.

Anne Owers
Chief Inspector of Prisons

July 2010

1. Summary

- 1.1 The findings in this report come from two sources: inspections conducted between February 2003 and September 2009 and pre-inspection surveys conducted with women between 2003 and 2008 (see Appendix I for more detail). Findings are summarised under the Inspectorate's four tests of a healthy prison – safety, respect, purposeful activity and resettlement – with a focus on findings from the most recent inspection of each of the 14 women's prisons.

Overview

- 1.2 In their most recent inspection, no women's prisons were assessed to be performing poorly in any of the healthy prison tests. However, three were not performing sufficiently well on safety, two on respect and three on resettlement. All women's prisons were performing reasonably well or well on purposeful activity. Askham Grange, one of the two open prisons for women, was the only adult prison to have been assessed as performing well across all four tests.
- 1.3 For prisons where performance in one of the healthy prison tests had slipped in the most recent inspections, this was sometimes linked to staffing issues or an increase in the range of roles the prison had to meet due to the re-role of other women's prisons to hold men.
- 1.4 Due to the limited number of women's prisons, many women were being held far from home, making resettlement and maintaining contact with family and children more difficult. The limited number of prisons for women also meant that prisons often had a complex range of roles to meet: holding children, young adults and adults; mothers and babies; and remand, short-sentenced, long-term sentenced women and indeterminate-sentenced women.
- 1.5 Many of the areas for improvement highlighted in this report link to the challenges of managing this complex range of roles, as well as the need to recognise and meet the distinct needs of women and different groups of women. This is hampered by the lack of national strategic direction for women's prisons within a male-dominated prison estate.

Safety

- 1.6 In the most recent inspection, four women's prisons – the two open and two semi-open prisons – were assessed to be performing well on safety, seven prisons were performing reasonably well and three were not performing sufficiently well. Three prisons, Morton Hall, Peterborough and Eastwood Park, had improved and one prison, Send, had slipped in their performance on safety.
- 1.7 Some women endured long journeys to prison, women were sometimes transferred with men, and there were examples of pregnant women being transferred inappropriately in cellular vehicles. Reception procedures had improved but there was a need to ensure that women with child welfare issues were identified and these issues followed up. First night procedures had also improved, although information was not always provided for late arrivals and there was a need for greater use of peer support. At some prisons, induction procedures did not fully occupy women's time and they spent many hours locked up in their cells.
- 1.8 More women reported having felt unsafe in their prison or having been victimised by another prisoner or by staff in 2006–08 than in 2003–05. Most bullying incidents involved verbal

intimidation and threats, with many issues associated with shared living in dormitories. At several prisons, anti-bullying or violence reduction strategies did not refer to the particular circumstances and manifestation of bullying among women. At several prisons, there was a need for improvement in the procedures for dealing with and monitoring bullying, staff training, support for victims and interventions for bullies.

- 1.9 A third (32%) of women reported feeling depressed or suicidal on arrival at prison. Levels of self-harm varied across prisons but were highest at local prisons. Both survey and inspection findings highlighted insufficient Listener support for women. The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring procedures varied across prisons, but at several there was a need for more consistent case management with multidisciplinary reviews and support. At prisons with high levels of self-harm, there were some concerns about the use of strip conditions and protective clothing. In addition to fatal incidents, near-fatal incidents needed to be investigated and action points identified.
- 1.10 At women's prisons with a segregation unit, there were some concerns about the use of separation, the physical condition of the units and the treatment of women while they were held there. Use of force was low at open, semi-open and training prisons, but at most locals there was a relatively high use of force with many incidents involving the removal of ligatures or prevention of self-harm. The recording and monitoring of use of force incidents varied across prisons.
- 1.11 In 2006–08, just under a third (30%) of women surveyed reported arriving at prison with a drug problem and a fifth (19%) with an alcohol problem. This was higher at local prisons with 42% reporting a drug problem and 27% an alcohol problem on arrival. Clinical management for substance users had greatly improved and this had made a significant difference to the safety of women arriving in prison. However, not all local women's prisons offered first night prescribing. Not all prisons had staff with dual-diagnosis expertise. The availability of drugs varied across prisons, and inspection reports noted some concerns with the procedures for suspicion testing at several prisons.

Respect

- 1.12 In their most recent inspection, two prisons, Askham Grange and Styal, were assessed to be performing well, 10 were performing reasonably well and two were not performing sufficiently well. Two prisons, Styal and Holloway, had improved and two, New Hall and Send, had slipped in how well they were performing on respect.
- 1.13 Staff-prisoner relationships were good at most prisons with 80% of women reporting that they had a member of staff to turn to and 71% reporting that most staff treated them with respect. However, at prisons with a high number of new, inexperienced or detached staff, relationships were adversely affected. Also, some prisons had too many male staff. Personal officer schemes were working well at some prisons, but needed developing at others, in particular to include family contact and sentence planning.
- 1.14 The standard of residential units, including shower facilities, varied both across and sometimes within prisons. In prisons with dormitory accommodation this was cramped and meant that women lacked privacy. In others, there were not enough phones on the units and calls could not always be made in private.

- 1.15 At many prisons, there was little differential between the different levels of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme and often little benefit for foreign national women to be on enhanced status.
- 1.16 Only just over a third (37%) of women surveyed in 2006–08 reported that the food was good, but women were more positive at the two open prisons. Inspection reports showed that the quality, quantity and variety of food differed across prisons. Women were not generally able to cook for themselves, even at open prisons, except in one long-term sentenced wing at Low Newton. In 2006–08, 45% of women said that the prison shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs. Black and minority ethnic and foreign national women were less likely to report this than white or British women respectively. Better consultation was required.
- 1.17 Although application and complaint forms were easily available at most prisons, there was poor logging of applications and unhelpful responses to complaints at some prisons.
- 1.18 The percentage of women reporting that it was easy to speak to their solicitors or legal representatives in 2006–08 had almost halved since 2003–05 (43% compared with 84%), and only 24% said it was easy to obtain bail information compared with 74% in 2003–05. Although provision varied across prisons, most inspection reports also noted inadequate legal services and bail information.
- 1.19 More work was required to meet the diverse needs of the women held. Not all prisons had a diversity policy, and at those that did, the policy often did not cover all diversity strands and was rarely based on a population needs analysis. Other than for race equality, diversity work was often non-existent or only in the early stages, although there were pockets of positive work. Across the diversity strands there were rarely support groups, consultation forums or diversity representatives, and there was a need for greater promotion of diversity. Not all staff had received diversity training, and diversity liaison officers were often stretched. Although racist incident reporting forms were often well investigated, some black and minority ethnic women were still reluctant to make complaints about staff. At most prisons there was insufficient translated information for women who did not speak or understand English very well, and little use of phone interpreting, even for confidential matters. Links with immigration varied and independent immigration advice was not always available to women. The cost of phone calls abroad was a key concern for foreign national women.
- 1.20 At most prisons, a good range of faiths was catered for and there was good access to services. Chaplaincy teams were well integrated within the prisons and were involved in a range of work.
- 1.21 Most mother and baby units provided a safe and supportive environment with good care planning for mothers and babies. However, the involvement of co-parents and family members varied. There were still examples of uniformed prison staff on the units. Across prisons there was a need for better care planning for pregnant women, and support for mothers who would be separated from their baby after the birth.
- 1.22 Women's perceptions and inspection report findings on health services varied across prisons. At several, there were long waits for the doctor and the dentist, and at some prisons chronic disease management needed improving. Two-thirds (67%) of women said that they were on medication at the time of the survey. At some prisons there were concerns about dispensing arrangements or the approach to medication held in possession.
- 1.23 Half (49%) of the women surveyed in 2006–08 said they had an emotional well-being or mental health issue. Those with problems were most likely to be receiving help from a doctor

or the mental health in-reach team, although 14% said that they were not receiving any help. Primary mental health services needed development. Secondary mental health services were better, although at some prisons services were stretched and there were still some delays in transferring women to mental health facilities.

Purposeful activity

- 1.24 In their most recent inspections, four prisons were assessed to be performing well and the other 10 were performing reasonably well. Five prisons, Askham Grange, East Sutton Park, Morton Hall, Eastwood Park and Peterborough, had improved and one prison, Bronzefield, had slipped in how well they were performing on purposeful activity.
- 1.25 Although few prisons were meeting our expectation of 10 hours a day out of cell, time out of cell was reasonable across women's prisons and was best at the two open prisons. At some prisons there were problems with cancelled association due to staff shortages.
- 1.26 In 2006–08 more women reported having had a job (80%), having been involved in vocational or skills training (67%) and in education (78%) while in prison than in 2003–05.
- 1.27 The overall management of education was good, but at many prisons better allocation to activities was needed. Full use was not always made of education capacity. At most prisons the level of teaching was good and there was a range of courses. At some prisons provision needed to match the population better: in particular, many prisons required greater provision of English for speakers of other languages (ESOL).
- 1.28 Most, but not all, prisons had sufficient work places for the population. As with education, there was often a need to improve allocation of women to jobs based on assessed needs. At several prisons the quality of work places and links to accreditation and qualifications needed improving.
- 1.29 Access to the library was good at most prisons, although not all offered evening or weekend sessions. Not all libraries stocked legal and Prison Service materials, books to support education and training, or books and newspapers for foreign national women. There was no internet access at any women's prison.
- 1.30 Access to the gym had improved, with a range of activities and some qualifications or accreditation offered, although at some prisons these could be developed further.

Resettlement

- 1.31 Only one prison, Askham Grange, was assessed as performing well in its most recent inspection, 10 prisons were performing reasonably well and three not sufficiently well. Three prisons, Askham Grange, Bronzefield and New Hall, had improved and no prisons had slipped in their performance.
- 1.32 The majority of women's prisons had a resettlement strategy, but several were not based on a needs analysis and strategies did not always cover the distinct needs of particular groups, such as young adults, foreign nationals, remand or short-sentenced women and lifers. Not all strategies covered the two additional pathways for women – for those who had experienced abuse or been involved in prostitution – and work in these areas needed development.

- 1.33 The change of function of some prisons from women to men meant that several were dealing with women held further away from home. This and the lack of national strategic direction for the women's estate were affecting the resettlement provision at some prisons.
- 1.34 In 2006–08, 55% of sentenced women said that they had a sentence plan. However, fewer than a third (27%) of women serving 12 months or under said that they had a sentence or custody plan, compared with 64% of women serving more than 12 months. Inspections noted that there was either no or insufficient custody planning for short-term sentenced and remand women. Several prisons had a backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments, sentence planning boards were not always multidisciplinary, and for women covered by offender management, there were often problems with offender managers being able to attend boards.
- 1.35 More women serving an indeterminate sentence said that they had a personal officer and a sentence plan than other sentenced women, and they were more likely to feel that they had done something or something had happened to them to make them less likely to offend in future. However, few prisons offered regular lifer days, lifer groups or surgeries, and there was insufficient information for those serving indeterminate sentences for public protection.
- 1.36 The identification of resettlement needs and the links to the appropriate services varied across prisons and were not always adequate.
- 1.37 Although at several prisons there were effective accommodation services, this was not the case at all, with services at some being stretched. Links with local employers and colleges were often insufficient to help women find employment or continue education. Although there were some good examples of support under the finance, benefit and debt pathway – such as money management courses and help with opening bank accounts – there was only limited help with debt management. Continuity of health care was often limited to a summary letter for GPs with limited help for women without a GP to register. Women managed under the care programme approach (CPA) by the mental health in-reach team benefited from better links to community services, but links for those with primary mental health needs, who are not covered by the CPA, were poorer.
- 1.38 Although all prisons had a drug strategy, they were not always up to date or based on a needs analysis, and there was rarely an alcohol policy. Prisons offered a range of courses, but not all provided one-to-one work and group work, and services for problem alcohol users were often limited to alcohol awareness classes or Alcoholics Anonymous. Not all courses had been adapted for women. Counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare service (CARATs) workers provided some good services and there were good throughcare links to community services.
- 1.39 At several prisons it was difficult for visitors to book visits by phone. Not all prisons had a visitors' centre or provided transport. At many prisons the visits hall was comfortable and welcoming, but children's play areas were not always supervised. Fifty-five per cent of survey respondents said that they had children under 18. All prisons offered children's days and there were some examples of positive work to help women maintain contact with their families. However, most prisons did not have a qualified family support worker and only some offered parenting courses.
- 1.40 Provision of offending behaviour programmes was not always based on a needs analysis and varied at individual prisons, with insufficient courses adapted or designed specifically for women.

2. Background to the report

Women prisoners

- 2.1 In April 2010, there were about 4,300 women in prison – 5% of the total prison population.¹ Many women sent to prison are serving short sentences for non-violent offences. In 2008, 12,676 women were received into prison.² Three-quarters of sentenced women received were serving less than 12 months. In September 2008, two-thirds (68%) of women were in prison for non-violent offences with the largest proportion, 25%, held for drug offences.³
- 2.2 Between 1998 and 2008 there was a 14% increase in the number of women entering prison on remand.⁴ Almost one in five (18%) women in prison on 26 February 2010 were on remand, either untried or convicted but unsentenced, compared with 15% of men.⁵ In 2008 women spent an average of 46 days in prison on remand.⁶
- 2.3 Recommendations made in the Corston Report,⁷ a review of women with particular vulnerabilities in the criminal justice system, included that custodial sentences for women should be reserved for serious and violent offenders who pose a threat to the public, with greater use and development of community alternatives for non-violent women offenders, and that women who are unlikely to receive a custodial sentence should not be remanded to custody.
- 2.4 Additionally, foreign national women make up a disproportionate 20% of the women's prison population.⁸ Many are serving long prison sentences for drug importation, although most are 'drug mules' rather than part of drug gangs.⁹ Many are single mothers, and being held outside their own country makes maintaining contact with children and family particularly difficult. The need to find alternative approaches for this group of women was recognised by the Commission on Women and the Criminal Justice System,¹⁰ and was highlighted in the Inspectorate's report *Women in prison: A literature review*.¹¹

Vulnerabilities

- 2.5 In line with the Corston Report, the vulnerabilities that many women in prison experience can be grouped into three main categories: domestic, personal and socioeconomic circumstances.

¹ HM Prison Service (2010). *Population monthly bulletin* – February 2010. Available at www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk

² Ministry of Justice (2009i). *Offender management caseload statistics 2008*, London: TSO.

³ Ministry of Justice (2008). *Population in custody monthly tables*, September 2008.

⁴ Ministry of Justice (2009i). *Op. cit.*

⁵ HM Prison Service (2010). *Op. cit.*

⁶ Unpublished analysis by Justice Statistics Analytical Services, Ministry of Justice.

⁷ The Corston Report (2007). *A review of women with particular vulnerabilities in the criminal justice system*, London: The Home Office.

⁸ Ministry of Justice (2009ii). *Population in custody*, England and Wales, June 2009.

⁹ Fawcett Commission Report on Women and the Criminal Justice System (2009). *Engendering justice – from policy to practice: Final report of the Commission on Women and the Criminal Justice System*.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2006). *Women in prison: A literature review*, London: HMIP.

Domestic circumstances

Children

- 2.6 Fifty-five per cent of women in prison have children under the age of 18 and 20% were living with dependent children before imprisonment.¹² The Social Exclusion Unit's 2002 report found that a fifth were living as lone parents before imprisonment.¹³ Although the Prison Service does not routinely record information on dependants, it is estimated that each year more than 17,700 children are separated from their mothers by imprisonment.¹⁴ Maintaining contact with children is made more difficult by the distance many women are held from their home area; in 2009, 753 women were held over 100 miles from home.¹⁵

Abuse

- 2.7 Studies have reported that as many as half of women in prison have experienced domestic violence, and up to a third have been victims of sexual abuse.¹⁶ Previous abuse often contributes to drug and alcohol problems, mental health problems and self-harm. In a case study of 50 prolific self-harmers for the Corston report, only 12 of the women reported that they had not experienced abuse or rape.¹⁷

Personal circumstances

Health

- 2.8 Women prisoners have poorer physical and mental health than women in the general population. An Office for National Statistics study in 2001 reported that 66% of women prisoners had symptoms of neurotic disorders, compared with 16% of the general household population.¹⁸ The Social Exclusion Unit's 2002 report found that 15% of sentenced women had previously been admitted to a psychiatric hospital.¹⁹
- 2.9 The Inspectorate's thematic report *The mental health of prisoners*²⁰ highlighted that more women than men suffered a level of psychological distress in prison, with 65% of women in our sample scoring above the threshold of clinical need in the GHQ12, a measure of psychological well-being, and 46% of women surveyed reporting that they needed help from health care staff for emotional well-being problems. The thematic recorded a range of areas where provision for mental health required improvement. These included the need for a national court diversion and liaison scheme, improved dual-diagnosis services, and a wider range of interventions in women's prisons to meet their high primary and secondary mental health needs. A 2007 report by the Care Services Improvement Partnership²¹ emphasised the need for better primary

¹² Ministry of Justice Research Series 16/08 (2008). *The problems and needs of newly sentenced prisoners: results from a national survey*.

¹³ Social Exclusion Unit (2002). *Reducing reoffending by ex-prisoners*, London: The Social Exclusion Unit.

¹⁴ Prison Reform Trust (2009). Bromley briefings prison fact file, November 2009.

¹⁵ *Daily Hansard*, House of Commons written answers, 25 November 2009.

¹⁶ The Corston Report (2007). *Op. cit.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ O'Brien, M., Mortimer, L., Singleton, N. and Meltzer, H. (2001). *Psychiatric morbidity among women prisoners in England and Wales*, London: TSO.

¹⁹ Social Exclusion Unit (2002). *Reducing reoffending by ex-prisoners*. London: The Social Exclusion Unit.

²⁰ HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2007). *The mental health of prisoners: A thematic review of the care and support of prisoners with mental health needs*, London: HMIP.

²¹ Care Services Improvement Partnership (2007). *Positive practice, positive outcomes: A handbook for professionals in the criminal justice system working with offenders with learning disabilities*.

mental health services for women in prison, as much of their need is associated with previous trauma and separation from children and family and is expressed in depression and anxiety.

Substance use

- 2.10 It was estimated in 2004–05 that 70% of women entering prison required clinical detoxification.²² The Social Exclusion Unit's 2002 report found that among sentenced women in prison, 55% reported drug use in the last year and 39% hazardous drinking.²³ The Inspectorate's thematic *Alcohol services in prison*²⁴ reported an increase in the proportion of prisoners reporting alcohol problems on arrival to prison in inspection surveys. For women, 29% reported an alcohol problem on arrival in 2008–09, an increase from 13% in 2004–05. The thematic also highlighted the need for better identification of those with alcohol problems, and a lack of funding for and provision of alcohol services in prison.

Self-harm and suicide

- 2.11 Although women make up only 5% of the total prison population, they account for almost half the self-harm incidents in prison.²⁵ From September 2008 to August 2009, 47% of reported incidents of self-harm were by women. This involved 11,747 incidents. In 2008, 1,502 individual women self-harmed.²⁶ This was a rate of 333 per 100,000 compared with a rate of 62 per 100,000 for men. The Corston report noted that 16% of women in prison self-harm compared with 3% of men.²⁷
- 2.12 In 2009, there were three self-inflicted deaths of women prisoners. This was a decrease from a peak of 14 in 2003.²⁸ The Social Exclusion Unit's report noted that over a third (37%) of women sent to prison had attempted suicide before imprisonment.²⁹

Socioeconomic circumstances

- 2.13 Many women prisoners have few qualifications: the Social Exclusion Unit found that 71% had no qualifications and a third of sentenced women in prison had been excluded from school.³⁰ Over a third (39%) had not worked outside the home in the year before imprisonment.³¹ While in prison, around a third of women lost their homes.³²

Alternatives to prison

- 2.14 Although the vulnerabilities outlined above are not unique to women prisoners, the Corston report found that the high level of complex needs, the socioeconomic and family consequences of imprisonment, and the different range of offending by women highlight that

²² Ministry of Justice's Women's Team (2004–5). *Business plan*, as cited in the Cabinet Office Social Exclusion Taskforce (2009). *Short study on women offenders*.

²³ Social Exclusion Unit (2002). *Op. cit.*

²⁴ HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2010). *Alcohol services in prisons: An unmet need*, London: HMIP.

²⁵ HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2010). *Annual report 2008–09*, London: HMIP.

²⁶ Data from the Safer Custody Group, as cited in the Cabinet Office Social Exclusion Taskforce (2009). *Op. cit.*

²⁷ The Corston Report (2007). *Op. cit.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ Social Exclusion Unit (2002). *Op. cit.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *Ibid.*

'there are fundamental differences between male and female offenders and those at risk of offending that indicate a different and distinct approach is needed for women'.³³

- 2.15 The need to develop community alternatives for non-violent women has been recognised for many years. In 2004, the cross-government three-year Women's Offending Reduction Programme (WORP) was set up with one of its aims being to reduce the number of women in prison. The government provided £9.15 million for WORP to develop the Together Women Programme. Five one-stop centres were developed in the North West and Yorkshire and Humberside areas to provide services to women offenders and women at risk of offending.
- 2.16 In addition to the Together Women Programme, there have been several other examples of community alternatives for women, such as the Asha Centre, the Women's Turnaround Project, WomenCentre, and Anawim centre. However, these alternatives would need to be greatly expanded if community solutions for non-violent women offenders are to become the norm, as stated in the Corston Report, and to provide a national network. A government-funded diversion programme was established in 2009 to divert women from custody with an additional £15.6 million investment in community services.³⁴
- 2.17 A study by the New Economics Foundation³⁵ looked at the use of community alternatives to short prison sentences for non-violent women. Using social return on investment (SROI) methodology, which takes into account broader economic and social costs, it concluded that over 10 years:

'For every pound invested in support-focused alternatives to prison, £14 worth of social value is generated to women and their children, victims and society generally.'

Women in prison in recent years

- 2.18 The Corston Report made 43 recommendations. Although the government accepted 40 of these, their implementation has been slow, despite cross-party support.
- 2.19 The government agreed to explore the recommendation that 'suitable, geographically dispersed, small, multi-functional custodial centres' should replace existing women's prisons within 10 years. However, the exploration decided that this would not go ahead as 'the size is just not sufficient to enable us economically to provide the sorts of services in each of these places that you would want to see'.³⁶
- 2.20 It was announced in December 2009 that a target had been set to reduce the number of prison places for women by 300 by March 2011 and 400 by March 2012.³⁷ The women's population has remained relatively stable over recent years. Prison population projections give a low, medium and high estimate for the women's population in 2012 as 4,100, 4,500 and 4,600 respectively.³⁸

³³ The Corston Report (2007). *Op. cit.*

³⁴ Ministry of Justice (2009iii). *A report on the government's strategy for diverting women away from crime.*

³⁵ New Economics Foundation (2008). *Unlocking value: How we all benefit from investing in alternatives to prison for women offenders.*

³⁶ Maria Eagle, then Justice Minister, quoted in 'Action on scandal of women in jail', *The Independent*, 8 August 2008 as cited in New Economics Foundation (2008). *Op. cit.*

³⁷ Ministry of Justice (2009iii). *Op. cit.*

³⁸ Ministry of Justice (2009iv). Prison population projections 2009–15 England and Wales.

- 2.21 There have been some welcome policy developments in recent years. These include: the Ministry of Justice gender equality scheme; the national service framework for women offenders; the offender management guide to working with women offenders; and the gender-specific standards outlined in Prison Service Order 4800 *Women Prisoners*.

Prison Service policy

- 2.22 As women in prison make up a small proportion of the total population they have often been an afterthought or neglected in prison policy. In April 2007, the gender equality duty of the Equality Act 2006 came into effect for public services, under which they have the duty to eliminate unlawful discrimination and harassment and to promote equality of opportunity between men and women.
- 2.23 In response, PSO 4800 *Women Prisoners* now includes gender-specific standards, which have been in effect since April 2009. Gender is also covered in the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) single equality scheme, with action points including the need to monitor delivery of PSO 4800, review the development of self-harm prevention strategies for women, and to gain accreditation for the women-specific offending behaviour programme CARE. Despite this recognition of the Prison Service's gender equality duty, Cookham Wood women's prison was re-roled to hold young men without an impact assessment of its effect on women prisoners, as is required in legislation.
- 2.24 The women's estate was previously separately managed by a director for women's prisons but, since April 2004, women's prisons have been managed geographically by area managers, supported by the NOMS women's and young people's group, which provides policy advice and operational support to women's prisons. This has included introducing two additional resettlement pathways – for women who have experienced abuse and women who have been involved in prostitution – and the introduction of the women awareness staff programme (WASP) for prison staff. However, there is still no clear national strategy for women's prisons.

The women's estate

- 2.25 Since 2003, five women's prisons have been re-roled to hold male prisoners due to population pressures in the male estate. These were: Brockhill (Redditch, Worcestershire), Buckley Hall (Rochdale, Lancashire), Bullwood Hall (Hockley, Essex), Cookham Wood (Rochester, Kent) and Edmunds Hill (Stradishall, Suffolk). In addition, Winchester and Durham, which both used to hold men and women prisoners, were changed to hold only men in 2004 and 2005 respectively.
- 2.26 There are currently 14 women's prisons in England and none in Wales. Each prison is briefly described below.³⁹
- Askham Grange is an open prison in York with a mother and baby unit. It holds sentenced adult and young adult women who meet the criteria for open conditions. The operational capacity is 128.
 - Bronzefield is a local prison in Ashford, Middlesex that opened in 2004. It is a private prison run by Kalyx. It holds remanded adults and young adults, short-term sentenced women serving up to six months and restricted status women, as well as acting as a first-stage lifer centre.

³⁹ Four women's prisons hold girls aged under 18: Downview, Eastwood Park, Foston Hall and New Hall. These units are inspected separately and are not covered in this report.

There is also a mother and baby unit. Since expansion in December 2009, the operational capacity is 527.

- **Downview** is a closed training prison in Sutton, Surrey, holding sentenced adult and young adult women, with a designated resettlement unit holding 40 women. It has a specialist function for foreign national women. The prison was opened in 1989 as a male prison but was re-roled to hold women in 2001. The operational capacity is 358.
- **Drake Hall** is a closed prison in Staffordshire. It has been a female prison since 1974 and was redesignated from an open to a semi-open prison in 2002. In March 2009 it was redesignated to a closed prison, but was still a semi-open prison when last inspected. The prison holds sentenced adult and young adult women and has a designated specialist function for foreign national women. Its operational capacity is 315.
- **Eastwood Park** is a local prison in Gloucestershire holding remanded and sentenced adult and young adult women. It became a female prison in 1996. It has a mother and baby unit. The operational capacity is 362.
- **East Sutton Park** is an open prison in Maidstone, Kent. It holds sentenced adults and young adults who meet the criteria for open conditions. The operational capacity is 100. In 2008 it became jointly managed with Blantyre House, a Kent resettlement prison for men.
- **Foston Hall** originally held only sentenced women, but in 2004 it was expanded to become a local prison holding both sentenced – including second-stage life-sentenced women – and remanded women and young adults, with further expansion in 2006. The operational capacity is 290.
- **Holloway** in London has been a local women's prison since the early 20th century. It holds remanded and sentenced adults and young adults, as well as serving as a first-stage lifer centre. It also has a mother and baby unit. The operational capacity is 501.
- **Low Newton** in Durham held both male and female remand prisoners until 1998 when it changed its function to a local prison for women. It holds remanded and sentenced adults and young adults, and also has a dangerous and severe personality disorder (DSPD) unit for up to 12 women with severe personality disorder. It has also been designated secure accommodation for holding restricted status women, as well as being a first-stage lifer centre. The operational capacity is 336.
- **Morton Hall** in Lincoln is an ex-RAF base that became an open prison in 1985. It changed function to a semi-open women's prison in 2001. Since the last inspection, it has been redesignated as a closed prison. The prison holds sentenced adult women and has a specialist function for foreign national women. It has an operational capacity of 392.
- **New Hall** in Wakefield became a local women's prison in 1987. It holds both remanded and sentenced adult and young adult women and is a first-stage lifer centre. It also has a mother and baby unit. Its operational capacity is 446. Its management has recently been amalgamated with that of Askham Grange in York.
- **Peterborough** opened in March 2005 and is the only prison to hold both male and female prisoners, who are kept separate at all times. It is a private prison run by Kalyx. It holds both remanded and sentenced, including life-sentenced, adult and young adult women, and also has a mother and baby unit. The operational capacity for the women's prison is 360.

- Send in Woking, Surrey became a women's prison in 1998 and was completely rebuilt in 1999. It is a closed training prison holding sentenced adult women, including second-stage life-sentenced women. It also houses a 20-bed addictive treatment unit, an 80-bed resettlement unit and a 40-bed therapeutic community (the only one for women). Its operational capacity is 282.
- Styal in Wilmslow, Cheshire is a local women's prison holding both remanded and sentenced, adult and young adult women, including second-stage life-sentenced women. The main prison buildings were originally built as an orphanage. In 1999, the remand wing was added to accommodate unsentenced women. There is a mother and baby unit. The operational capacity is 459.

Scope of this report

- 2.27 This report examines how effective prisons are in meeting the needs of women. Although the focus is on the performance of women's prisons, these findings should be considered within the wider debate about the appropriateness of prison for women who have not been charged with or convicted of violent offences.
- 2.28 The report follows a similar format to the healthy prison summary at the start of inspection reports, providing an overview on the Inspectorate's four key areas: safety, respect, purposeful activity and resettlement. Each section begins with an overview of how women's prisons have performed in that area over the last five years. The main body of the report then focuses on findings from the most recent inspection of each of the 14 women's prisons.
- 2.29 Findings refer only to the adult and young adult populations held at these prisons and exclude the four units for young women aged 18 and under.
- 2.30 The findings come from two main sources: inspection reports and prisoner surveys (see Appendix I for more detail).

Inspection reports

- 2.31 This report focuses on the most recent inspection report for all 14 women's prisons, conducted between September 2007 and September 2009, but inspections conducted between February 2003 and September 2009 were analysed to provide a long-term perspective. In total, 37 inspection reports were analysed, including full inspections, full follow-up inspections and short follow-up inspections (see Appendix II).

- 2.32 Assessments are made against each of the healthy prison tests of safety, respect, purposeful activity and resettlement, on a rating of one to four. In the healthy prison summaries covered in this report,⁴⁰ these assessments were defined as follows:
- '... performing well against this healthy prison test.*
There is no evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in any significant areas.
- ... performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test.*
There is evidence of adverse outcomes for prisoners in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns.
- ... not performing sufficiently well against this healthy prison test.*
There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of prisoners. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.
- ... performing poorly against this healthy prison test.*
There is evidence that the outcomes for prisoners are seriously affected by current practice. There is a failure to ensure even adequate treatment of and/or conditions for prisoners. Immediate remedial action is required.'

Assessments are made at both full and follow-up inspections.

Prisoner surveys

- 2.33 Findings refer to a representative sample of female prisoners surveyed between 2003 and 2008. Data in 2006 to 2008 include inspection surveys conducted at 12 prisons, and data for 2003 to 2005 cover inspection surveys conducted at nine prisons.⁴¹ The self-reported demographic profile of women surveyed is shown in Appendix III. Survey data has been analysed in two ways:

- A comparison between the 1,099 survey responses collected from 2006 to 2008 and the 721 survey responses collected from 2003 to 2005⁴² (see Appendix IV).
- A comparison within the 1,099 2006 to 2008 survey results of:
 - o responses from black and minority ethnic women and white women
 - o responses from foreign national women and British women

⁴⁰ These assessments were redrafted in late 2009 as follows:

- outcomes for prisoners are good against this healthy prison test.

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

- outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

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

- outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

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

- outcomes for prisoners are poor against this healthy prison test.

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

⁴¹ As this report comments on the performance of the current 14 women's prisons, survey responses from women at prisons that have since re-rolled to hold male prisoners have been excluded from the survey analysis.

⁴² Survey questions have changed between 2003 and 2008. Where questions have been added or changed, data is not available for 2003–05.

- o responses from women aged 50 or over and those under 50
- o responses from those who considered themselves to have a disability and those who did not
- o responses from lesbian or bisexual women and heterosexual women
- o responses from young adult women (those aged under 21) and those 21 or above
- o responses from women sentenced to less than 12 months and those serving 12 months or more
- o responses from women serving an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP) or life sentence and all other sentenced women
- o responses from foreign national women at Drake Hall and Morton Hall and foreign national women at other prisons.

2.34 Differences in survey results that are mentioned in the text are statistically significant. The following key is used in tables, in line with how survey data are presented in inspection reports:

	significantly better than the comparator
	significantly worse than the comparator
	no significant difference

Overall performance

- 2.35 In the 2008 full inspection of Askham Grange, the prison was judged to be performing well across all four tests of a healthy prison. It was reported to be a safe place, with very good staff-prisoner relationships. Reintegration services were good and there was some excellent family support work. It is the only adult prison to have been judged to be performing well against all four healthy prison tests. Askham Grange has recently become jointly managed with New Hall, a women's local prison almost 40 miles away. There are concerns that this will have a negative impact on performance at Askham Grange.
- 2.36 Bronzefield was the first private female prison. In its first inspection in 2004, it was performing reasonably well on safety and respect, well on purposeful activity, and not sufficiently well on resettlement. At its most recent inspection in 2007, resettlement had improved and it was assessed to be performing reasonably well. However, purposeful activity had slipped to performing reasonably well. This was linked to staffing problems, which had curtailed activities and had also affected staff-prisoner relationships. The prison was still performing reasonably well for safety and respect.
- 2.37 In 2003, Downview was assessed to be performing reasonably well on safety and respect and not sufficiently well on purposeful activity and resettlement. The prison had struggled as a result of its frequent change in role in previous years due to national population pressures; it

required stability and clarity of direction. At the inspection in 2006, the prison was more settled and at this and the 2008 inspection the prison was assessed to be performing reasonably well across all four healthy prison tests. The re-role of Cookham Wood in 2007 from women to young men under 18 had increased Downview's catchment area.

- 2.38 At Drake Hall in 2004 and 2007, the prison was performing well on safety, reasonably well on respect and purposeful activity, but not sufficiently well on resettlement. At the 2007 inspection the population ranged from women serving three days to women serving life, and a third of the population were foreign nationals. The prison was meant to be a low security semi-open prison that specialised as a foreign national prison, but the range of risks and needs posed a challenge for managers to provide appropriate resettlement services. As with the previous inspection in 2004, the needs of foreign national women were not adequately addressed.
- 2.39 At its 2008 inspection, Eastwood Park was found to have improved since the 2003 and 2006 inspections and was performing reasonably well across all four healthy prison tests. This was commendable as the prison held adults, young adults and young people, as well as having a mother and baby unit. One in five of all women and more than one in three young adults were more than 100 miles away from their homes.
- 2.40 At the 2006 inspection, East Sutton Park shared a single governor with Cookham Wood, a neighbouring local women's prison. Due to shared policies, the inspection noted concerns that the distinct needs of East Sutton Park, an open prison, were overlooked. Those circumstances changed with Cookham Wood's change of function from women to young men. In June 2009, a follow-up inspection noted that the management of the prison had been combined with Blantyre House men's resettlement prison. Although the prison was performing well on safety and purposeful activity and reasonably well in the other two healthy prison tests, a key concern was that the joint resettlement strategy did not adequately reference the specific needs of women.
- 2.41 Foston Hall's 2004 inspection report highlighted concerns about how prepared the prison was for the planned opening of a remand unit and a separate young people's unit. The 2007 inspection noted the impact of the change from a settled, sentenced population to a more vulnerable and volatile population. The prison had not adjusted to its role and proper provision had not been made for the new population. Foston Hall had gone from performing well on safety and purposeful activity to performing reasonably well. The assessments for the other two tests remained the same: reasonably well on respect and not sufficiently well on resettlement. These assessments remained the same in the 2009 inspection, which noted that although it remained a generally safe and respectful prison, the prison was still adapting to its expanded role.
- 2.42 Due to the shrinking of the women's estate, Holloway has had to perform multiple roles, holding adults and young adults, as well as having a mother and baby unit and acting as a first-stage lifer centre. Its performance in three healthy prison tests remained the same for the 2004 and 2008 inspections – not performing sufficiently well on safety and performing reasonably well on purposeful activity and resettlement. The assessment on respect had improved from not performing sufficiently well to performing reasonably well. As with other local women's prisons, there were high levels of self-harm and many women felt unsafe, not helped by the physical layout of the prison, especially the dormitory accommodation.
- 2.43 The operational capacity at Low Newton in 2006 had expanded by a third since the 2004 inspection. It also now housed a dangerous and severe personality disorder (DSPD) unit for up to 12 women and had designated secure accommodation for holding restricted status women. Despite this, in 2009 the prison was assessed to be performing reasonably well on safety,

respect and resettlement and well on purposeful activity. There was a relaxed, open and supportive approach, and the changes to hold restricted status women had been implemented well with no obvious detrimental effect to the ethos of the prison.

- 2.44 In 2003, Morton Hall was not performing sufficiently well on any of the four healthy prison tests. As with Drake Hall, the prison had undergone a number of changes in role, as well as struggling with the ambiguity of a semi-open security level. The next inspection in 2005 found a prison that had settled into its role as a semi-open prison with a specialist foreign national function, and the prison was assessed as performing reasonably well across all tests. In 2007, the prison was still performing reasonably well on respect and resettlement, and had improved and was performing well on safety and purposeful activity.
- 2.45 New Hall holds a needy and challenging population of sentenced and unsentenced women, young adults and young people, as well as having a mother and baby unit. In the three inspections since 2003, the prison had been assessed as performing reasonably well on safety. There had been improvement in purposeful activity and resettlement, which were performing reasonably well in 2008. However, under the test of respect the prison had gone from performing reasonably well in 2003 and 2006 to an assessment of not sufficiently well in 2008. The inspection noted a decline in staff-prisoner relationships and a negative culture among some staff.
- 2.46 Peterborough opened in 2005 as the only prison to hold both men and women, although they are held separately. The first inspection in 2006 found that many of its processes were based on the needs of men, and the prison was assessed as not performing sufficiently well across all four tests. The follow-up inspection in 2008 found that there had been efforts to create distinct procedures for women, although these still needed further development. The prison was assessed as performing reasonably well on safety and purposeful activity but was still not performing sufficiently well on respect and resettlement. Women felt that staff were unhelpful, which was linked to the inexperience of staff. The prison was supposed to be operating as a first-stage lifer prison, but this had not been well planned or resourced.
- 2.47 In 2008, Send had seen an increase in capacity, with more short-sentenced women held there. There had been three governors in less than two years and it faced further uncertainty due to a clustering arrangement with Downview in Sutton. In both the 2006 and 2008 inspections, the prison was performing reasonably well on purposeful activity and resettlement. However, assessments for safety and respect had declined by 2008. Safety had gone from performing well in 2006 to not performing sufficiently well in 2008, and respect had dropped from performing well to performing reasonably well. Performance had also been undermined by the high number of new inexperienced staff and staff on detached duty from other prisons unfamiliar with dealing with women.
- 2.48 As with many women's prisons, Styal had to meet a range of functions, holding remand, short-sentenced, young adult women and lifers. However, there was a particularly high level of complex need at Styal, and it held a challenging and disturbed population. Assessments remained the same in 2005 and 2008 for safety and resettlement, not performing sufficiently well on the former and performing reasonably well on the latter. There had been a marked improvement in respect and the prison had gone from not performing sufficiently well in 2005 to performing well in 2008. In 2005, inspectors had noted a significant distinction between the remand wing and the rest of the prison in relation to purposeful activity. The remand wing was assessed separately as performing poorly in this area, while the rest of the prison was performing reasonably well. In 2008, the remand wing had improved, with fewer women held there, and was assessed as performing reasonably well, in line with the rest of the prison.

3. Safety

Overview: healthy prison assessments for safety

Table 1: Safety assessments for women's prisons between 2003 and 2009⁴³

Prison	Functional type	Year of inspection	Safety assessment
Askham Grange	Open	2004	Performing well
		2006	Performing well
		2008	Performing well
Bronzefield	Local	2005	Performing reasonably well
		2007	Performing reasonably well
Downview	Trainer	2003	Performing reasonably well
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
Drake Hall	Semi-open	2004	Performing well
		2007	Performing well
Eastwood Park	Local	2003	Not performing sufficiently well
		2006	Not performing sufficiently well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
East Sutton Park	Open	2003	/
		2006	Performing well
		2009	Performing well
Foston Hall	Local	2004	Performing well
		2007	Performing reasonably well
		2009	Performing reasonably well
Holloway	Local	2004	Not performing sufficiently well
		2008	Not performing sufficiently well
Low Newton	Local	2003	/
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2009	Performing reasonably well
Morton Hall	Semi-open	2003	Not performing sufficiently well
		2005	Performing reasonably well
		2007	Performing well
New Hall	Local	2003	Performing reasonably well
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
Peterborough	Local	2006	Not performing sufficiently well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
Send	Trainer	2006	Performing well
		2008	Not performing sufficiently well
Styal	Local	2004	Performing poorly
		2005	Not performing sufficiently well
		2008	Not performing sufficiently well

⁴³ Assessments for each healthy prison test were introduced during 2004, although some prisons inspected before this date were assessed retrospectively. All assessments have been included where they exist.

- 3.1 Since 2003, the majority of prisons had improved or maintained reasonable performance against this healthy prison test. In the most recent inspection:
- Four of the 14 women's prisons were assessed as performing well: the two open and two semi-open women's prisons. This was an improved assessment for Morton Hall. These four prisons were fundamentally safe with satisfactory reception and first night procedures and no significant issues of bullying or self-harm. There was little or no use of force or segregation and little drug use in the prisons.
 - Seven prisons were assessed as performing reasonably well. This included two local prisons, Peterborough and Eastwood Park, which had improved from an assessment of not performing sufficiently well in their previous inspection. Issues to be addressed across the seven prisons included improvement in first night and reception procedures, better monitoring of bullying, use of force and segregation, and improvements in the procedures for caring for women who self-harmed.
 - Three prisons were not performing sufficiently well: Send (discussed below), Holloway, and Styal. At Holloway, too many women felt unsafe and reported endemic bullying, and at Styal many women on the remand wing felt unsafe. At both prisons there was too much reliance on use of force to manage disturbed women, violence reduction procedures were not robust, and improvements in services for substance misusers were also needed. For both prisons the assessment had remained the same as the previous inspection.
- 3.2 One prison's assessment had slipped:
- Send had gone from performing well in the 2006 inspection to not performing sufficiently well in 2008. In 2006, although first night and induction procedures needed improving, women felt safe on their first night. There were low levels of self-harm, with good reviews. There were also low levels of use of force and segregation, and little evidence of bullying. At the 2008 inspection, first night and induction procedures were still poor. Women reported feeling unsafe on their first night, which was linked to the design of the wing and poor access to staff. Levels of self-harm had increased, and this could not be completely explained by the increase in the population. There was no violence reduction strategy, and the good work carried out by staff in dealing with some vulnerable and difficult women was undermined by the high number of detached duty staff.

Escorts and transfers

- 3.3 In 2006–08, women reported a better experience during escort than in 2003–05: they were more likely to report feeling safe during transfer, that attention had been paid to their health needs, and to rate the cleanliness and comfort of the van as good, although the latter was still very low at only 15% (see Table 2).

Table 2: Escorts – women's survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
How was the cleanliness of the van (good/very good)?	48%	39%
How was your personal safety during the journey (good/very good)?	60%	55%
How was the comfort of the van (good/very good)?	15%	13%
How was the attention paid to your health needs (good/very good)?	35%	31%
Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	7%	9%
Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71%	72%

- 3.4 Seven per cent of women in 2006–08 reported spending more than four hours in the van, an improvement on the 9% in 2003–05. However, some women still endured long journeys and some individual experiences were very poor. At the Eastwood Park inspection it was noted that some women had had considerable journeys, as the prison served about 70 different courts. There were still examples across women's prisons of women spending long days in court, with some arriving back at prison after 7pm, and an underuse of the video-court link.
- 3.5 Women were more likely to have received written information about what would happen to them prior to arriving at their current establishment in 2006–08 than in 2003–05, although this was still low at 16%. Inspection reports supported this, with concerns that women were given little notice of transfer and little information before arriving. At Peterborough, information had been prepared for distribution at courts but few women appeared to have received it.
- 3.6 In the most recent inspection reports, there were still concerns that women were being transferred inappropriately in cellular vehicles with men. Additional concerns from reports included pregnant women being transported inappropriately in cellular vehicles, and at Drake Hall special transport had not been provided for a woman with a disability, which meant that her journey had been particularly difficult and uncomfortable. At Askham Grange, although there were efforts to transport women to the prison in the prison's own transport, most women had arrived in cellular vehicles, which were inappropriate and unnecessary for transfer to open conditions. Similarly at the other open prison, East Sutton Park, most women arrived in cellular vehicles.

First days in custody

Reception

- 3.7 The most recent inspection reports indicated that many reception areas were bright, clean and welcoming. However, this was not true of all prisons and several had limited or no space for private interviews. At Morton Hall, although the reception area was clean and welcoming, it was too small, with no space to conduct private interviews; it was recommended that a new building was required.
- 3.8 In many reports it was noted that reception staff were friendly and helpful in reception. This was supported by the survey results, in which 75% of women said that they were treated well

in reception in 2006–08 compared with 69% in 2003–05. At Styal, there had been particularly noticeable improvements: each new arrival was interviewed by the reception officer who then took her to the first night centre. Some prisons, such as Eastwood Park and New Hall, used Insiders in reception to provide peer support. However, at other prisons there was no formalised peer support service at this stage.

- 3.9 Women were more likely to report that they had been searched in a respectful way in 2006–08 compared with 2003–05 – 79% against 76%. However, at Holloway all women were strip-searched on arrival behind flimsy curtains and, unsurprisingly, in the inspection survey, fewer women reported that they were searched in a respectful manner than at other local prisons. At Morton Hall and Send, all women were strip-searched on arrival rather than on a risk assessed basis. We welcome the fact that, after repeated recommendations from the Inspectorate, routine strip-searching of women stopped in all women's prisons in 2009.
- 3.10 Although an improvement on the 2003–05 survey results, only half (49%) the women in 2006–08 said they had the opportunity to have a shower on arrival and two-thirds (68%) a free phone call. Surprisingly, fewer women in 2006–8 than in 2003–05 reported that they were seen by health services staff in reception – 85% compared with 89%.
- 3.11 Fewer women said they had problems on arrival, although this was still high at 72% and was highest at local women's prisons, with 78% of women reporting problems on arrival. For 2006–08, about two-thirds of all women surveyed said that staff had asked whether they needed help with contacting their family, with health problems, or for feeling depressed or suicidal. Despite the fact that many women are sole carers for children, only 30% of women in 2006–08 said that staff had checked whether they had any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after. At the New Hall inspection it was noted that insufficient attention was given to identifying and following up urgent issues concerning the welfare of children, whereas at Holloway, Prison Advice and Care Trust (PACT) workers and peer supporters provided practical support for new arrivals with an emphasis on childcare issues.
- 3.12 Although women were more likely to report that they had been offered a range of information on arrival, this only represented about half of respondents. At Drake Hall, despite the high number of foreign national women, most information in reception was only available in English, whereas at Peterborough a well-produced information book was available in foreign languages. At Morton Hall, prisoner interpreters were used rather than a professional phone interpreting service, which compromised confidentiality.

First night

- 3.13 Good first night procedures are important across all prisons, but particularly at local prisons where many women being received are new arrivals to custody. First night procedures varied across local prisons, and the level and quality of support sometimes depended on the time women arrived. Peterborough had improved its first night support but this depended on the time of arrival, and there was a need to ensure that issues raised were systematically followed up. At Bronzefield there was a TV information channel, but women were not told about it. Information was insufficient and inconsistent, and late arrivals were not seen until the next day. Likewise at Eastwood Park, a mini-induction was provided on the first night but late arrivals did not have this until the next day. At Foston Hall there was no formal first night strategy.
- 3.14 Training and open prisons only receive women who have transferred from another prison. As with local women's prisons, provision varied. At Downview, prisoner Insiders gave good support but there was little input from staff. At Drake Hall, all new arrivals had a first night talk and individual interviews, but provision was rushed, and although women had a brief free

phone call there was no advance phone credit so that they could talk to their families properly. The two open prisons provided good support to women on arrival. Prisoner buddies helped provide support at Askham Grange, and at East Sutton Park an induction orderly supported new arrivals on their first day, showing them around the prison and introducing them to their room mates.

- 3.15 Three-quarters (74%) of women in 2006–08 said that they felt safe on their first night. This was lower at local prisons, where 68% of women reported feeling safe. Both were similar proportions to 2003–05. At Eastwood Park, a third (35%) of the women said they felt unsafe on their first night, and this was largely young adult women. At Styal, many survey respondents said they felt unsafe, and some reported that sharing with detoxifying women was frightening.
- 3.16 A higher proportion of women at training and semi-open/open prisons reported feeling safe on their first night, 82% and 85% respectively. However, at the Send inspection women said they felt unsafe and this was related to the poor physical design of the wing, as well as poor access to staff.

Induction

- 3.17 More women in 2006–08 than in 2003–05 said that they had been on an induction course: 89% compared with 84%. In 2006–08, two-thirds of women (64%) who had been on an induction course said it covered everything that they needed to know, better than the 58% in 2003–05.
- 3.18 At Askham Grange, all women received a well-delivered induction talk the day after arrival. At New Hall, there was a well-organised induction programme that was professionally delivered, with interviews to identify resettlement needs the day after arrival. At Drake Hall, new arrivals met the governor, which they welcomed.
- 3.19 However, at several prisons women on induction were not fully occupied and spent too much time locked behind their doors. For example, although the induction at Drake Hall had been shortened to a week, there were still periods of inactivity. At Send, there was a need for management oversight of the induction programme, which was not run to schedule, with some departments regularly missing their slots. As a result, many women waited up to three weeks for work with long periods of lock up. Additionally, not all induction programmes covered enough information.
- 3.20 There were some concerns about induction arrangements for women withdrawing from drugs. Eastwood Park had introduced a system where new arrivals taking part in a detoxification programme joined the induction programme on day five. At other prisons, induction arrangements for women withdrawing from drugs were less structured.
- 3.21 Although more foreign national women than British women reported having been on an induction, 96% compared with 87%, inspections noted some issues in ensuring that the induction needs of foreign national women were met. At Holloway there was little for women who did not understand English, and at Morton Hall foreign national women received a poorer induction, despite the use of prisoner interpreters.

Bullying and violence reduction

- 3.22 Many more women in 2006–08 than in 2003–05 reported that they had felt unsafe in their prison (40% compared with 33%). More also reported that they had been victimised by another prisoner or by staff, and had felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff. However, in 2006–08 they were less likely to report having felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners.

Table 3: Safety – women's survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	40%	33%
Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	28%	24%
Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	21%	18%
Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners?	32%	38%
Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff?	22%	16%

- 3.23 Most bullying at women's prisons appeared to involve verbal intimidation and threats. At Holloway, women said that some level of bullying and pilfering of possessions was an accepted aspect of life. The prison's own survey, as well as the inspection survey, suggested that victimisation was prevalent and indeed worse than at the previous inspection. Many incidents were associated with problems of living together in dormitories and most were relatively minor, but nevertheless distressing for the women involved. Likewise, at other prisons with dormitories, many incidents involved difficulties caused by shared living.
- 3.24 The majority of women's prisons had an anti-bullying or violence reduction strategy. However, there were examples of strategies that did not refer to the particular circumstances and manifestation of bullying among women. Not every prison had effective monitoring, although some prisons managed this well. For example, at Foston Hall bullying incidents were monitored at the safer custody meeting.
- 3.25 At Askham Grange, bullying incidents were investigated well and some were appropriately resolved through group meetings or by short periods of monitoring. Likewise, at the other open prison, East Sutton Park, minor disputes were quickly and appropriately resolved, often through room meetings or mediation. However, at the majority of women's closed prisons, procedures for dealing with incidents required improvement. There were examples of poor record-keeping, limited help for victims or interventions for bullies. At Styal, most bullies were moved to the remand wing, which already housed the most problematic women and where more women reported feeling unsafe than elsewhere in the prison.
- 3.26 At some women's prisons, staff were alert to potential bullying and challenged bullying behaviour. Foston Hall had a small team of prisoner anti-bullying representatives. However, at other prisons staff were not informed of the strategy or trained in mediation where it was used. For example, at Holloway, mediation was sometimes attempted but staff were untrained and one recorded example had been handled very badly. The physical design of certain prisons made it difficult for staff to supervise, for example at Holloway and New Hall.

Self-harm and suicide

- 3.27 A third (32%) of women in 2006–08 and 2003–05 reported feeling depressed or suicidal on arrival at prison. Although women were more likely in 2006–08 than in 2003–05 to say that they had received information about what support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal, they were less likely to report meeting a Listener/Samaritans within the first 24 hours. There had also been a decrease in the proportion of women who said that they could speak to a Listener at any time if they wanted to. This was supported by inspection reports, which found there were not enough Listeners at several women's prisons. The Holloway inspection report noted that a Listener suite and safer cells had been introduced. Despite this, Listeners had to talk to distressed women through door flaps during patrol states and at night, which did not provide an acceptable level of confidentiality.

Table 4: Self-harm and suicide – women's survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
When you first arrived, did you have any problems feeling depressed or suicidal?	32%	32%
On your day of arrival, were you offered information about what support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	49%	43%
Within the first 24 hours, did you meet a Listener/Samaritans?	27%	32%
Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	64%	73%

- 3.28 Although women make up only 5% of the prison population, they account for 47% of recorded self-harm incidents.⁴⁴ The level of self-harm incidents varied by functional type and was highest at local women's prisons. At Low Newton, the number of incidents had increased, and it was usual for 10% or more of the population to have an open assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) document, with an average of about 80 incidents each month. At Styal, about 70 ACCT documents were opened each month, and at Holloway about 60. In contrast, at the open and semi-open prisons there were low levels of self-harm. At Askham Grange, incidents of self-harm were rare and this was helped by the relaxed environment, largely supportive relationships between prisoners and staff, and the good level of activity. There had only been one woman who had returned to closed conditions for more intensive supervision. At Morton Hall, there was little actual self-harm and most ACCTs were opened due to staff concern. At East Sutton Park, there were few recorded incidents of self-harm, although some women reported fears that if they disclosed feeling vulnerable they would be returned to closed conditions.
- 3.29 ACCT procedures and support varied across prisons and reviews were often not multidisciplinary. At Drake Hall, the ACCT procedures were good, with multidisciplinary involvement and good ongoing support. At Downview, some ACCT procedures needed improving: there was poor recording and little continuity of case management. More positively, Holloway had made efforts to involve families in the support of women at risk.
- 3.30 At a small number of prisons, staff had not received appropriate training: at Downview only half the senior officers had received ACCT case manager training. At Styal, many senior officers

⁴⁴ HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2010), *Annual report 2008–09*, London: HMIP.

had not had case manager training, and about 50 staff had not had training in the basic procedures; few night staff had been trained in first aid. At Holloway, many night staff did not have a good awareness of emergency procedures.

- 3.31 At Askham Grange, there were appropriate resources to support women with personal anxieties, including a counselling service with only a short waiting list and some complementary therapies. At Downview, counselling was only available for those who were mentally ill. Holloway had a good range of counselling services. Peterborough had very good resources, but they were not effectively targeted to support women at risk of self-harm. The Keller unit at Styal was used as a high dependency unit. There were high levels of self-harm on the unit and a very high level of use of force associated with this. Although there were good links with mental health services, the unit had no therapeutic lead and staff were not sufficiently trained to deal with the complex issues that arose.
- 3.32 At women's prisons with high levels of self-harm, inspection reports raised some concerns about the use of strip conditions and protective clothing and the monitoring of their use. At Bronzefield, strip conditions were often used in the health services centre for women at risk of self-harm, and some were held overnight without any written observations. At Downview, special accommodation and protective clothing were sometimes used in a crisis without a clear account that other options had been considered. At Styal, women's 'care plans' on the Keller unit included the use of strip conditions, and force was used to place women in protective clothing against their will, which was inappropriate. At Send, the use of the constant observation cell was poorly documented, with insufficient management oversight. Additionally, at Foston Hall some constant watches took place in the segregation unit, which was an inappropriate location for women at risk of self-harm.
- 3.33 Near-fatal incidents were not always investigated to identify learning points and develop action plans. For example, at Send, 12 incidents resulting in outside hospital treatment had not been investigated. There were some concerns about the implementation of recommendations from self-inflicted deaths. At Holloway, action plans from investigations into previous deaths were monitored but not all recommendations had been implemented. At Styal, there had been three self-inflicted deaths since the previous inspection, but little had been done to develop initial action plans before the final external investigation reports were received. However, some serious incidents had been investigated and learning points identified. Foston Hall had experienced its first two self-inflicted deaths in custody in the previous 30 months and had taken action to address the recommendations from the investigation.

Security and rules

- 3.34 At Askham Grange, there were few formal charges, with minor breaches of rules appropriately dealt with through informal warnings or the incentives and earned privileges scheme. In contrast, at Peterborough, there was a relatively high number of adjudications and many were about minor matters that could have been resolved in a different way. At Drake Hall a number had procedural flaws and better quality checks were needed. Adjudications at Styal were usually held on the unit so they were less formal and more relaxed. However, there were inconsistencies in which cases were referred to the independent adjudicator.
- 3.35 Records at Askham Grange showed that adjudications were generally conducted fairly with reasonable punishments. However, at Morton Hall there was inconsistent application of punishments for similar offences. Downview and New Hall overused cellular confinement as a punishment.

Discipline

- 3.36 Some women's prisons did not have a segregation unit, including Askham Grange, Styal and Eastwood Park. At the latter, women segregated on good order or discipline (GOOD) or waiting for adjudication under Prison Rule 53 were held in their own cells. However, both closed prisons (Styal and Eastwood Park) had units where challenging or very vulnerable women could be held. The Eastwood Park unit was run effectively as a support unit, but the Styal unit was in practice a segregation unit by a different name.
- 3.37 At most women's prisons, the regime in the segregation unit was satisfactory. However, at some prisons there were concerns about the use of the segregation unit or the procedures for looking after women while they were held there. The segregation unit in Drake Hall was little used and only for short periods, but it was used inappropriately for loss of association. Previous records showed that all women entering the segregation unit had been strip-searched; it was unclear whether this was still the case at the time of inspection due to poor recording. At Downview there was poor recording and monitoring of the unit's use. Staff shortages meant that there was no permanent staffing during patrol state, even when the unit was occupied. At Foston Hall some women were held in the segregation unit for respite, which was inappropriate, and some women with severe mental health problems stayed too long in segregation while awaiting transfer to mental health facilities.
- 3.38 There were also concerns about the physical condition of some segregation units. At Drake Hall and Morton Hall the exercise areas were poor. At Downview the environment was drab. A room on the unit in Holloway was being refurbished to provide an activities area, likewise at New Hall.
- 3.39 Provision at Bronzefield was often undermined by the use of staff who had not received specialist training to work in the segregation unit. In contrast, Peterborough staff had received mental health awareness training and had good links with the mental health in-reach team.
- 3.40 At several women's prisons there was little use of special accommodation, but there were concerns about the recording of its use and some examples of women held overnight despite not exhibiting any violent behaviour. At Bronzefield the management of women in the special cells in the health care centre needed to be tighter, and in Styal there was too much use of the special cell.
- 3.41 There was little use of force at the open, semi-open and training women's prisons. Indeed at Askham Grange there had been no use of force, and at Send only four incidents in the six months before the inspection. The use of force had decreased at New Hall and was relatively low. However, at other local women's prisons there tended to be high levels of use of force. At Holloway many incidents involved mentally disturbed women in the health care centre, whereas at Eastwood Park incidents mainly related to fighting, assaults or refusals to relocate, with almost a quarter of incidents occurring on K wing, which housed particularly difficult or vulnerable women. Use of force had increased in Low Newton, and this seemed to correlate with the increase in incidents of self-harm.
- 3.42 The recording and monitoring of use of force incidents varied. At New Hall records were well kept and levels were monitored at security meetings, although trends could have been better recognised. At Downview some forms were unaccountably missing and records were often not clear about what had led to the use of force. Across prisons, it was not always clear from records that de-escalation had been used. Records in Foston Hall showed that force had been used to gain compliance or on women who were already compliant, which was unjustifiable.

Substance use

Table 5: Substance misuse – women’s survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
Did you have a drug problem when you came into this prison?	30%	55%
Did you have an alcohol problem when you came into this prison?	19%	21%

- 3.43 In the survey, just under a third (30%) of women in 2006–08 said they had arrived at prison with a drug problem and a fifth (19%) an alcohol problem. At local prisons, the first point of entry to custody, these proportions were unsurprisingly higher, with 42% of women reporting a drug problem and 27% an alcohol problem on arrival.
- 3.44 Both the proportions for all women surveyed in 2006–08 were lower than in 2003–05. However, this masks the recent increase in the proportion of prisoners, including women, reporting alcohol problems on arrival that was highlighted in the Inspectorate’s *Alcohol services in prisons* thematic.⁴⁵ In 2008–09, 29% of women reported alcohol problems on arrival, an increase from 13% of women in 2004–05. As this is self-reported data these figures are likely to underestimate the scale of the problem.
- 3.45 Inspection reports noted that services had improved, and this had made a significant difference to the safety of women arriving in prison. At some prisons, including Bronzefield and Holloway, both local prisons, there was still no first night prescribing. However, at Holloway detoxification arrangements were much improved. Many new arrivals went to the detoxification unit on their first night and were held there until they were fit to leave. There was follow up by a nurse specialist and good post-detoxification support. At New Hall, 80% of new arrivals went to the substance misuse unit, highlighting the high level of drug dependency. The unit provided a safe environment and treatment began on their first night, although support services were limited.
- 3.46 The introduction of the integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) had improved the level of care for women requiring stabilisation and detoxification at Eastwood Park and Styal. Eastwood Park drug services were well integrated and there was good clinical management. The pilot project which provided training for women in administering naloxone on release to treat opiate overdose was an example of good practice. Peterborough had good clinical protocols and staff had received appropriate training. In some prisons, more support for women detoxifying was required, including after the initial detoxification stage.
- 3.47 Methadone maintenance was now available at the majority of women’s prisons and at all local women’s prisons. Methadone maintenance was available at one open prison, Askham Grange, and plans were beginning to be made at the other, East Sutton Park. There was some concern at Styal and Eastwood Park about the dispensing of methadone and the supervision of women on methadone.
- 3.48 Some prisons had good links with health services and CARATs, and others had specialist GPs or substance misuse nurses. However, there was not always dual-diagnosis expertise.

⁴⁵ HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2010). *Alcohol services in prisons: An unmet need*, London: HMIP.

- 3.49 The availability of illegal drugs varied across prisons. It was low at open and semi-open prisons. At Askham Grange the reported random mandatory drug testing (MDT) level was 3% and women did not report widespread drug use or availability. East Sutton Park and Morton Hall also had little evident drug use. The situation varied in closed prisons. Bronzefield had comprehensive supply reduction procedures, and the reported MDT rate had reduced from 12% to 2.6%. At Downview there were active security measures to deal with the drug problem, which were coordinated through a dedicated supply reduction meeting. However, gaps in testing meant that reported MDT figures were unreliable. Although the reported MDT rate at New Hall was reasonable at 5.8%, this would have risen substantially if Subutex, refusals and diluted samples were taken into account. Women in New Hall said that drugs were easily available.
- 3.50 At several prisons there were concerns about suspicion testing. Suspicion testing was poor at Eastwood Park, with few positives due to delays in testing. Holloway had a low reported MDT rate of 1.7% but there was insufficient testing, including suspicion testing. At New Hall, although many security information reports were related to drugs, there had been few suspicion tests and those that had been done had only a 10% positive rate. At East Sutton Park, all women returning from release on temporary licence (ROTL) were tested for alcohol, which seemed unnecessary.

4. Respect

Overview: healthy prison assessments for respect

Table 6: Respect assessments for women's prisons between 2003 and 2009⁴⁶

Prison	Functional type	Year of inspection	Respect assessment
Askham Grange	Open	2004	Performing reasonably well
		2006	Performing well
		2008	Performing well
Bronzefield	Local	2005	Performing reasonably well
		2007	Performing reasonably well
Downview	Trainer	2003	Performing reasonably well
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
Drake Hall	Semi-open	2004	Performing reasonably well
		2007	Performing reasonably well
Eastwood Park	Local	2003	Performing reasonably well
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
East Sutton Park	Open	2003	/
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2009	Performing reasonably well
Foston Hall	Local	2004	Performing reasonably well
		2007	Performing reasonably well
		2009	Performing reasonably well
Holloway	Local	2004	Not performing sufficiently well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
Low Newton	Local	2003	/
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2009	Performing reasonably well
Morton Hall	Semi-open	2003	Not performing sufficiently well
		2005	Performing reasonably well
		2007	Performing reasonably well
New Hall	Local	2003	Performing reasonably well
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2008	Not performing sufficiently well
Peterborough	Local	2006	Not performing sufficiently well
		2008	Not performing sufficiently well
Send	Trainer	2006	Performing well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
Styal	Local	2004	Not performing sufficiently well
		2005	Not performing sufficiently well
		2008	Performing well

⁴⁶ Assessments for each healthy prison test were introduced during 2004, although some prisons inspected before this date were assessed retrospectively. All assessments have been included where they exist.

4.1 Since 2003, the majority of prisons had maintained reasonable performance against this healthy prison test. In the most recent inspection:

- Two prisons were performing well: Askham Grange and Styal. Askham Grange had continued to perform well, whereas Styal had gone from not performing sufficiently well in 2005 to performing well in 2008. In 2005 there was too much overcrowding, staff-prisoner relationships were not as good on the remand wing as they were in the rest of the prison, women were not always provided with sufficient clothing or basic toiletries, and they were dissatisfied with the food, applications and complaint processes. This had improved by the next inspection, and the remand wing was much improved with a calmer environment and fewer women held there. Both prisons had good staff-prisoner relationships, mother and baby units and health services. However, although health services were good at Styal, they were insufficient to meet the need. At Askham Grange dormitories were cramped.
- Ten prisons were performing reasonably well. These prisons were characterised by generally positive relationships between staff and prisoners. Issues to be addressed included development in personal officer work, diversity issues and health services, and some concerns about cramped dormitory accommodation. Holloway had improved from not performing sufficiently well in the 2004 inspection to performing reasonably well in 2008. In 2004, the prison was dirty, with an ineffective personal officer scheme, and staff-prisoner relationships were poorer than at most other women's prisons. Some of the basic systems in health care were inadequate. In 2008, the prison was much cleaner and health care had improved. Staff-prisoner relationships had improved but were mixed, and personal officer work was still underdeveloped.
- Two prisons, New Hall (described below) and Peterborough, were not performing sufficiently well. At Peterborough most women said that staff were unhelpful, mainly due to their inexperience, and there was little interaction between staff and women. There was little confidence in the applications and complaints processes, diversity work needed developing, and perceptions of health services remained poor, although there had been some progress. This was similar to the findings at the 2006 inspection, when Peterborough was also assessed as not performing sufficiently well.

4.2 Two prisons' assessments in the area of respect had got worse:

- New Hall had been assessed as performing reasonably well in 2003 and 2006, but in 2008 was not performing sufficiently well. In previous inspections, good staff-prisoner relationships had been noted, but in 2008 a negative culture among some staff was reported with women generally having a poor view of officers. Although there were some good individual interactions, there was also evidence to support the women's perceptions. Some poor living conditions were noted. In 2008, we deemed cramped and cold dormitories as unfit for purpose, health services were stretched, and some diversity work was only in the early stages.
- In 2006, Send was performing well, but in 2008 was performing reasonably well. In the 2006 inspection, accommodation and health care were good, race relations were satisfactory, but work with foreign national women needed development. However, in 2008 the inspection found that the high number of detached duty staff from other prisons, who were unused to working with women, had jeopardised relationships. Some women were very dissatisfied with health care, and foreign national work was still in its infancy.

Staff-prisoner relationships

Table 7: Staff-prisoner relationships – women’s survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
Do you have a member of staff in this prison who you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	80%	77%
Do most staff in this prison treat you with respect?	71%	73%
Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	23%	27%

- 4.3 The majority (80%) of women in 2006–08 said that they had a member of staff to turn to if they had a problem, a slight improvement on 2003–05. Just under three-quarters of women said that most staff treated them with respect in 2006–08 and 2003–05. This was supported by inspection reports, which found staff-prisoner relationships were generally good in many women’s prisons. Only a quarter (23%) of women in 2006–08 said that staff normally spoke to them during association, lower than in 2003–05. At Foston Hall, although staff-prisoner relationships were mostly good, almost all staff referred to adult women as ‘girls’.
- 4.4 At Morton Hall, women had a mixed view of staff, and establishing good relationships was harder in a prison with many different cultures and nationalities. At some prisons there were problems due to shortages or a high turnover of staff. This was particularly the case in privately-managed prisons. At Bronzefield there was a high turnover of staff and many were new and inexperienced. Although there were positive interactions, women felt many staff were unsupportive or only helped their favourites. Many women in Peterborough felt that officers were unhelpful, often due to their inexperience. There were also problems at one publicly managed prison, Send, because of the arrival of a large number of detached duty staff, many of them men, to cover new accommodation. The prison had requested a better gender balance but had little control over the supply of staff. Other prisons, such as Peterborough and New Hall, also had relatively high proportions of male staff. At the latter, women complained that male staff entered their rooms without knocking.
- 4.5 At some prisons, such as Downview and Holloway, women complained of inconsistent treatment and favouritism. At Holloway, there was some recorded evidence of unhelpful treatment and limited awareness of women’s needs. Some wing history sheets in New Hall contained unacceptably derogatory comments and indicated little empathy or understanding of women with mental health problems.

Personal officers

- 4.6 In 2006–08, 70% of women said that they had a personal officer, compared with only half in 2003–05. Despite this improvement in survey results, inspection reports found that the personal officer scheme was better developed at some prisons than others. For example, personal officer work was good at the open and semi-open prisons Askham Grange, East Sutton Park and Morton Hall. At New Hall and Peterborough, both local prisons, most women knew who their personal officer was, but few found them helpful. The number of detached duty staff had affected the effectiveness of the personal officer scheme at Send, with regular staff being in the minority and therefore stretched, and some women complained that their personal

officers were never available. The Eastwood Park scheme was cell-based and, in some cases, this meant regular changes of personal officer. Staff understood their role as personal officers, though prisoners said that they were more likely to turn to the member of staff available rather than their personal officer. The Downview scheme was poorly developed and many women were unaware that they had a personal officer.

Table 8: Personal officers – women's survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
Did you have a personal officer?	70%	50%
For those with a personal officer, do you think they are helpful/very helpful?	69%	71%

- 4.7 In 2006–08, 69% of women who said they had a personal officer felt that they were helpful – similar to the proportion in 2003–05. As part of each inspection, wing files are looked at to help gauge the level of support from staff, and in particular personal officers. At the majority of women's prisons, comments by personal officers were mainly observational, showing little interaction or knowledge of women and few, if any, references to sentence plan targets, resettlement needs or family contact. Even at the prisons where comments were more detailed and showed good interaction with women, entries rarely referred to all these areas. At Eastwood Park, some wing file contributions were excellent but personal officers had yet to put into practice their supposed role in relation to custody plans. Askham Grange had introduced an electronic history sheet so that staff could add entries wherever they were in the prison. Most wing files contained monthly personal officer reports based on a helpful pro forma that covered sentence plan targets and other relevant factors, although it did not mention family contact.

Residential units

- 4.8 At most women's prisons, communal areas were clean and well maintained. The standard of accommodation, however, varied both across and within prisons. Most of the accommodation at Drake Hall, Morton Hall, Low Newton and Send was good. Styal had a mixture of houses, which were generally good, and a large mainly remand wing, which was poorer. However, the remand wing had a better environment than during previous inspections as fewer women were held there. Most of the accommodation at Foston Hall was good, but some of the remand unit was not as well kept and one wing was cramped. The accommodation at Eastwood Park was poor across the board. One wing was urgently in need of refurbishment and one wing needed attention to cleanliness and graffiti. At Drake Hall two units needed replacing.
- 4.9 Across prisons, dormitory accommodation was cramped and lacked privacy, and shared cells did not always have adequate toilet screens. At Eastwood Park some single cells were shared, and at Peterborough some women had to share poorly ventilated cells.

Table 9: Residential units – women’s survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	55%	59%
Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	89%	83%
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	76%	85%
Have you had any problems getting access to the phones?	24%	29%

- 4.10 Three-quarters (76%) of women in 2006–08 said that they received clean sheets every week, which was worse than in 2003–05, and fewer women said they were offered enough clean clothes for the week: 55% compared with 59% in 2003–05. However, there was a good selection of clean second-hand and new clothing available at Holloway. Laundry facilities varied across prisons, with adequate or good access at many. However, Holloway had unsatisfactory laundry and drying facilities.
- 4.11 The majority of women (89%) in 2006–08 said they could have a shower every day, an improvement on 2003–05. However, access to and the condition of showers varied. In Styal, only 56% of the women on the remand wing said they had daily access to a shower, and some showers on the houses were dated, with peeling paintwork. Population pressures at Morton Hall meant that some women were in cells where showers did not work and therefore had to share inadequate bathroom facilities. At Styal, free toiletries were provided on the remand wing but not in the rest of the prison. At Peterborough, sanitary items had to be requested often from male staff.
- 4.12 Fewer women reported problems accessing phones in 2006–08 than in 2003–05, although a quarter (24%) still had problems. At some prisons there were not enough phones, and they could not be used in private in all prisons. Askham Grange had an incoming call facility, which helped women to keep in touch with their children. At the other open prison, East Sutton Park, there was good access to phones and these could be used in private, but there were no incoming calls. No closed prisons had facilities for incoming calls.

Incentives and earned privileges scheme

- 4.13 Most prisons had an IEP policy, although these varied in quality. At many prisons there were few differentials between the levels of the scheme and, in particular, there was often little benefit for foreign national women in being on enhanced status.
- 4.14 The application of the scheme varied. Downview had a good system of reviews and decisions were clearly explained to women. The use of warnings was monitored and staff were challenged as necessary. However, at other prisons women could be put on basic for a single act rather than a pattern of behaviour, or warnings were given for petty infringements. At Styal some sanctions, such as loss of association, were imposed without proper authority or review. At New Hall, some automatic moves to basic within the scheme were unacceptable, as was the curtailment of unconvicted women’s legal rights to visits. A high proportion of those on basic level were women at risk of suicide and self-harm.

Catering

- 4.15 In 2006–08, just over a third (37%) of women surveyed said that the food was good or very good, compared with 27% in 2003–05. However, this was still low. Inspection reports indicated that the quality, quantity and range of food available varied across prisons. Life-sentenced and long-term prisoners on one wing at Low Newton had cooking facilities, but these were not generally available at other prisons, even the two open prisons.
- 4.16 At Askham Grange, 79% of women surveyed said that the food was good. The food was also good at the other open prison, East Sutton Park, which used fresh food from the prison farm. At Drake Hall, women were positive about the quality of food and there were many healthy options, although some women arrived back from work too late for a hot meal. Women in Peterborough and Holloway complained that food was sometimes cold, and some temperature checks at Holloway had indicated that food had been served below acceptable temperatures. At Low Newton women were dissatisfied with the food and there were too many packed meals.
- 4.17 Drake Hall and Eastwood Park had good consultation about food. At the latter, catering staff attended prisoner representative meetings and there was a twice-yearly catering survey that led to alterations in the provision.
- 4.18 Askham Grange had little direct consultation with black and minority ethnic women and more diversity of provision was needed. Eastwood Park had no halal utensils in the kitchen or the serveries. However, the survey showed no significant difference overall between the proportion of black or minority ethnic women and white women who said that the food was good, at just over a third (37% and 36% respectively). Foreign national women were more likely than British women to say that the food was good or very good – 40% compared with 36% – but all percentages were relatively low.

Prison shop

- 4.19 Only a fifth (21%) of women surveyed in 2006–08 said they had access to the prison shop within 24 hours of arrival, worse than in 2003–05. Inspection reports also highlighted this issue. At New Hall and Send, women could wait up to 10 days before receiving their first order, depending on their day of arrival. There were also delays in receiving orders at Styal. There were concerns about the price of prison shop items, which were often too expensive.

Table 10: Prison shop – women’s survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	21%	26%
Does the prison shop/canteen sell a wide range of goods to meet your needs?	45%	40%

- 4.20 More women in 2006–08 than in 2003–05 said that the prison shop sold a wide enough range of goods, although this was still fewer than half the respondents. However, prison shop options did not adequately cater for the diverse needs of women. Only a third (34%) of black and minority ethnic women said that the prison shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs, compared with half (49%) of white respondents. Foreign national women were also less likely than British women to say that the prison shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs, 38% compared with 46%. This was supported by inspection report

findings, which also noted poor consultation with women about provision. However, there was a good range at Morton Hall to cater for its diverse nationalities.

Applications and complaints

- 4.21 At most prisons, women were able to get application forms easily, but not always at Drake Hall. In 2006–08, 83% of respondents said that they had made an application, similar to 2003–05. At Eastwood Park, as well as the written application system, women could resolve simple queries face to face with an officer each morning. Conversely, though, at Downview women were unhappy with the new application system as they had to discuss the reasons for each application with an officer before submission.

Table 11: Applications – women’s survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	87%	85%
Have you made an application?	83%	85%
For those who had made an application:		
Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	59%	64%
Do you feel applications are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	50%	57%

- 4.22 Of the women who had made an application, fewer in 2006–08 than in 2003–05 felt that they were dealt with fairly or promptly. This was supported by inspection report findings. At Bronzefield, applications were not always collected daily and could not be tracked. Both staff and the women were unsure how the application system worked. At Holloway, applications were logged but the dates of responses were not recorded so it was not possible to check the efficiency of the system. Women in Morton Hall said there were delays in getting responses, but they were not logged well enough to check this. In contrast, all applications at Askham Grange were recorded, tracked and answered promptly, and women were positive about how they were handled.

Table 12: Complaints – women’s survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	84%	82%
Have you made a complaint?	51%	63%
For those who had made a complaint:		
Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	42%	52%
Do you feel that complaints are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	46%	49%

- 4.23 Similar proportions of women in 2006–08 and 2003–05 said they could access complaint forms easily, although fewer women in 2006–08 said that they had made a complaint. At the Send inspection it was noted that the number of complaints had risen, and at Bronzefield complaint

forms were not easily accessible, with forms and boxes in clear view of officers. More positively, at Morton Hall, the complaints procedures were explained in a range of languages, and at Drake Hall a prisoner advice centre helped women complete applications and complaints.

- 4.24 Of the women who had made a complaint, fewer in 2006–08 said that it was dealt with fairly or promptly. Women in Peterborough and Send had little confidence in the complaints procedures, although consultation meetings had just started in Send. At some prisons, complaints were responded to in a respectful manner that answered the points raised. Senior managers in Askham Grange monitored complaints. At other prisons, responses to complaints were not always respectful or helpful. For example, at New Hall many replies were poor or did not answer the points raised, and managers did not monitor their quality.
- 4.25 In both survey periods, about a quarter of respondents who had made a complaint said that they had been encouraged to withdraw it. The Eastwood Park inspection reported that a local survey had identified concerns about women pressurised to withdraw complaints. This was consistent with our inspection survey, in which 36% of respondents said that they had been encouraged to withdraw a complaint. One investigation there had established that a woman had been inappropriately pressured to withdraw a complaint about a member of staff.

Legal rights

- 4.26 The percentage of women reporting that it was easy to speak to their solicitors or legal representatives in 2006–08 had almost halved: 43% compared with 84% in 2003–05. Fewer women in 2006–08 said that it was easy to attend legal visits and only a quarter (24%) reported that it was easy to obtain bail information, compared with 74% of women surveyed in 2003–05. Fewer women in 2006–08 said that staff had opened letters from their solicitor when they were not with them.

Table 13: Legal rights – women’s survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	43%	84%
Is it easy/very easy to attend legal visits?	57%	85%
Is it easy/very easy to obtain bail information?	24%	74%
Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	37%	45%

- 4.27 Inspection reports show that legal provision varied across prisons but at most there was inadequate provision. This is likely to reflect two factors: the absence of legal services training for Prison Service staff, which has been discontinued, and the restrictions on criminal legal aid for solicitors. At Drake Hall legal services were well advertised but women reported not getting answers to applications or replies being delayed. There was no profiled time for the task and the provision did not match the needs of women, particularly foreign nationals. New Hall had a good bail information scheme but no ready access to legal services information and there was no trained legal services officer.
- 4.28 However, some prisons provided a better service. At Eastwood Park a bail and legal services officer saw all women on arrival. Although there was good use of the video link for solicitors'

visits, access to legal visits was limited because of booking and capacity difficulties. Volunteer solicitors from a local law firm visited Styal twice a week to provide free advice about a range of relevant legal issues. At Foston Hall, an executive officer saw all new arrivals on reception and offered help with legal services and bail information. A quarter of remand prisoners had been bailed in 2009 and many had bail information reports that the executive officer had provided.

Diversity

- 4.29 Not all women's prisons had a diversity policy, and even at prisons that did these rarely covered all diversity strands. Apart from race equality, diversity work was often only in the early stages or non-existent. There were rarely support groups, consultation forums or diversity representatives. However, there was some positive work. For example, at Downview, an over-50s forum had been formed. Morton Hall's disability policy included guidance and information for staff, and some good care was provided, although not all women with disabilities were identified. At the New Hall inspection, a group for women with disabilities and older women and one for lesbian and bisexual women had recently been set up. Styal had positive senior management commitment and support for promoting diversity and an active diversity resource centre. There was a range of prisoner forums on diversity issues, which had begun to identify areas for improvement.

Race equality

- 4.30 Twenty-eight per cent of women surveyed in 2006–08 said that they were from a black or minority ethnic background. These women reported a poorer experience than white women for 68 (36%) of the survey questions and a better experience for 36 (19%) questions. There was no significant difference for the other 87 questions.
- 4.31 Black and minority ethnic women were more likely to report that their religious beliefs were respected and were less likely to have emotional well-being, drug or alcohol problems than white women. They were also more positive about their level of involvement in and usefulness of activities, and reported greater use of the library and gym. However, black and minority ethnic women had a poorer experience than white women in a range of areas – including reception, the first few days, and access to and fair treatment in applications and complaints. They were also less likely to feel that staff treated them with respect or that they had a member of staff to turn to, and were more likely to have felt threatened or intimidated by staff. Black and minority ethnic women also said they received fewer visits than white women, and were less likely to know who to contact for help with resettlement issues.
- 4.32 Inspection reports indicated that all women's prisons had a race equality action team (REAT) or equivalent that met regularly and often involved at least one prisoner representative, although these meetings needed external representation. As with the other diversity strands, most prisons had no general forums or consultation groups with black and minority ethnic women. Morton Hall was the exception and women there were regularly consulted. There was also a well-resourced diversity team with prisoner representatives who were trained with staff.
- 4.33 There was a need for better promotion of cultural diversity at most prisons. However, Send had diversity displays throughout the prison, and Styal had good promotion and organisation of events to celebrate cultural diversity throughout the year.
- 4.34 At many prisons the proportion of black and minority ethnic staff was far smaller than the proportion of black and minority ethnic women held. For example, at Drake Hall almost 50% of

prisoners were from a black and minority ethnic background compared with only 3% of staff. This usually reflected the locality of the prison, so, for instance, at Holloway over half the women prisoners and almost half the staff came from black and minority ethnic backgrounds.

- 4.35 Not all staff had received diversity training. For example, at Drake Hall fewer than half the staff had undertaken diversity training and many black and minority ethnic women said that some officers were disrespectful towards them. At Low Newton the proportion of staff who had received diversity training had increased from 18% to 74%.
- 4.36 Not all race equality officers (REOs) had sufficient time or resources to fulfil their role. At Peterborough, the REO had to cover both the men's and women's prisons and also dealt with foreign national issues, so was extremely stretched. Eastwood Park had a full-time REO with a part-time assistant. They were struggling to manage the increasing demands of diversity issues and foreign national women.
- 4.37 At many prisons racist incident reporting forms (RIRFs) were well investigated, with external scrutiny at a few. At Eastwood Park racist incident forms were well investigated and quality checked by the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) and Hibiscus⁴⁷ workers. Despite this, some black and minority ethnic women reported a reluctance to make complaints about staff. At Morton Hall learning points from investigations into RIRFs were shared with women and staff.
- 4.38 The quality of investigations needed improving at some prisons. At Bronzefield there were delays in responding to RIRFs and examples of poor investigations that had been signed off by the director. At Drake Hall RIRFs were usually answered promptly, but not all were rigorously investigated and several women said they lacked confidence in the system.

Foreign national prisoners

- 4.39 Seventeen per cent of women surveyed in 2006–08 said that they were foreign nationals. They reported a poorer experience than British national women for 63 (33%) of the survey questions and a better experience for 46 (24%) questions. There was no significant difference for the other 82 questions.
- 4.40 Foreign national women reported better access to clothes and showers and were less likely to have emotional well-being, drug or alcohol problems than British women. They were more positive about activities and made greater use of the library and gym. Foreign national women said they had had poorer access to application and complaint forms, and fewer had made an application than British women. More reported victimisation by prisoners and staff because of their ethnicity and feeling unsafe at the time of the survey. They were less likely to feel that staff treated them with respect or that they had a member of staff to turn to, and were more likely to have felt threatened or intimidated by staff. Foreign national women were also less likely than British women to know who to contact for help with resettlement issues.
- 4.41 Most, but not all, women's prisons had a foreign national policy although these varied in quality and were not always based on a population needs analysis. In some prisons the foreign national liaison officer was overstretched and did not have enough time to fulfil their role. Although 75% of women at Morton Hall were from overseas, there was no full-time foreign national lead as this was seen as a core function of the prison. However, this approach was

⁴⁷ Hibiscus is part of the registered charity Female Prisoners Welfare Project (FPWP), which caters specifically for the special needs of foreign national and British-based black and minority ethnic women in prison (<http://fpwphibiscus.org.uk/>).

not wholly successful and common issues were not always identified. At Drake Hall, where 30% of women were foreign nationals, the policy was only basic and the liaison officer was also the race equality officer with only 16 hours a week dedicated to meet both these roles, which was insufficient.

- 4.42 In a comparison between foreign national women at Drake Hall and Morton Hall, the two prisons with a specialist foreign national function, and foreign national women surveyed at other women's prisons, those at Drake Hall and Morton Hall reported more positively on a range of areas, although there were some areas where they reported more negatively. Across Drake Hall and Morton Hall, more foreign national women reported receiving written information before they arrived about what would happen to them. All reported having been on an induction course and 76% found it useful, compared with 57% of foreign national women at other prisons. However, only 37% reported that it was easy to attend legal visits, compared with 58% of foreign national women at other prisons. Those at Drake Hall and Morton Hall were more positive about the applications and complaints process, and more reported having a personal officer and a member of staff to turn to. Fewer reported feeling unsafe, 28% compared with 51%, although more reported feeling threatened or intimidated by a member of staff, 32% compared with 19%.
- 4.43 As with the other diversity strands, there were no consultation groups or forums for foreign nationals at most of the prisons. However, Holloway had held a foreign national forum and Styal had a well-attended forum. Some prisons relied heavily on Hibiscus workers to provide support to foreign national women, but these workers were often overstretched.
- 4.44 The amount of translated material for women with little or no English varied, but at most prisons there was very little and also little use of phone interpreting, even for confidential matters. Peterborough had some good translated information and pictorial induction information. Holloway made good use of prisoner and staff interpreters but little use of professional phone interpreting, even for confidential matters. There was a touch-screen information point in a range of languages in the resettlement areas.
- 4.45 The cost of phone calls abroad was a key concern for many foreign national women. The Morton Hall report highlighted the need for more imaginative solutions. At Drake Hall, Hibiscus helped women to maintain contact with their family, but the service was overstretched.
- 4.46 Some prisons ran regular immigration surgeries, although links with immigration services varied and independent immigration advice was rarely available to women. At Downview, which was close to London, there were regular immigration surgeries and Detention Advice Service surgeries.

Young adult women

- 4.47 Nine per cent of the women surveyed in 2006–08 said they were aged under 21. These young women reported a poorer experience than women aged 21 and over for 66 (35%) of the survey questions and a better experience for 27 (14%) questions. There was no significant difference for the other 98 questions.
- 4.48 Young adult women reported a poorer experience in the first few days and were less likely to have felt safe on their first night. They were also more likely to have felt threatened or intimidated by staff, and say that staff had made insulting remarks about them or their family. They reported a poorer experience on wings, such as having access to clean clothes and showers, and only a quarter (24%) said that the food was good compared with 38% of women aged 21 and over. Young adult women were also less likely to feel that staff treated them with

respect or report that they had been involved in activities in the prison. However, young adult women were more positive about visits and staff help in maintaining contact with family and friends.

- 4.49 Young adult women were more likely to report an alcohol problem on arrival at prison and to feel that they would have an alcohol problem on release. Although they were less likely to report arriving at prison with a drug problem, they were more likely to report developing a drug problem in prison.
- 4.50 The Low Newton inspection found that young adult women were held across the wings, and we questioned whether it was appropriate to hold them on the longer-term wings.

Older women

- 4.51 Nine per cent of the women surveyed in 2006–08 said that they were aged over 50. Older women reported a poorer experience than women under 50 for 26 (14%) of the survey questions and a better experience for 61 (32%) questions. There was no significant difference for the other 104 questions.
- 4.52 Older women were less likely than those under 50 to report problems on arrival at the prison or that staff had asked them if they needed any help or support. They said they had better access to clothes and showers, and easy access to application and complaints forms. Older women who had accessed the doctor, nurse, dentist and optician were more likely to report that the quality of service was good than women under 50. They were also more likely to be on medication. Older women were less likely to report emotional well-being or drug or alcohol problems. They reported greater involvement in activities, and were less likely to think they would have problems on release.

Prisoners with disabilities

- 4.53 Fourteen per cent of women surveyed during 2006–08 considered themselves to have a disability. They reported a poorer experience than those without disabilities for 93 (49%) of the survey questions and a better experience for only seven (4%) questions. There was no significant difference for the other 91 questions.
- 4.54 Women with disabilities reported a poorer experience during transfer and their first days in prison, with fewer feeling safe on their first night. More women with a disability than those without said they arrived at prison with problems. They also reported poorer access to clean clothes and showers and less involvement in activities. They were also more likely to have felt unsafe at some point and at the time of the survey, and to have been victimised and felt threatened or intimidated by staff and other prisoners. Women with disabilities were also less likely to say the quality of health services was good, although a greater proportion said they were on medication. Those who said they had emotional well-being problems were also more likely to say they were being helped by a doctor, nurse or psychiatrist.
- 4.55 Neither of the open women's prisons, East Sutton Park and Askham Grange, could accommodate women with severe mobility impairments. As highlighted in the Inspectorate's thematic report *Disabled prisoners*,⁴⁸ inspections found that there were problems with identifying and recording women with disabilities, a need for care plans, and insufficient funding, training and support for staff.

⁴⁸ HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2009). *Disabled prisoners: A short thematic review on the care and support of prisoners with a disability*, London: HMIP.

Sexual orientation

- 4.56 Twenty-two per cent of women surveyed in 2006–8 said that they were lesbian or bisexual. They reported a poorer experience than heterosexual women for 79 (41%) of the survey questions and a better experience for 21 (11%) questions. There was no significant difference for the other 91 questions.
- 4.57 Women who were lesbian or bisexual reported a poorer experience on the wing, and were less likely to feel that applications and complaints were dealt with fairly compared with heterosexual women. They were also less likely to report that staff had treated them with respect or that they had a member of staff to turn to for help, and were more likely to report having felt unsafe at some point and having been victimised by other prisoners or staff. Lesbian and bisexual women reported a poorer experience of access to health services and quality of care, and were more likely to report arriving at prison with a drug and/or alcohol problem and to feel that they would have a problem on release, as well as other resettlement problems such as finding accommodation.

Mothers and babies

- 4.58 Seven women's prisons have mother and baby units. On 31 January 2008 there were places for 75 mothers and 82 children.⁴⁹ The upper age limit for children that can be catered for is nine months at two of the units and 18 months at the other five units, although there is some flexibility in this. Women with children have to apply for a place on these units and decisions focus on the well-being of the children.
- 4.59 Inspections found that most of these units provided a safe and supportive environment, although at Eastwood Park the mattresses were not suitable, and mothers at New Hall found the rooms cold at night. On most units mothers were not able to cook for their children, which undermined the development of normal parenting skills and responsibility.
- 4.60 Care planning was good for mothers and babies on most units, although care plans were poor at Holloway when we inspected in 2008. At Askham Grange the care planning process included frequent reviews involving a multidisciplinary team. However, across prisons there was a need for care plans for pregnant women and provision of better support for mothers who would be separated from their baby after the birth.
- 4.61 The involvement of co-parents and family varied. There was good work at Styal to involve co-parents, siblings and other family members, whereas Eastwood Park had no provision for co-parent involvement before or after the birth. At Holloway there were no special visits arrangements for fathers and they were unable to be involved in antenatal care.
- 4.62 Specialist childcare professionals were involved in the running of most, but not all, units. Askham Grange and New Hall had childcare professionals involved in the running of the units but Prison Service staff staffed the units and wore uniform, which was inappropriate. At Styal the unit was run by Action for Children staff who were highly motivated and experienced and this was assessed as the best mother and baby unit seen, with appropriate parental responsibility being developed and devolved to mothers. Children were regularly taken out into the community. Likewise, at Askham Grange, a well-equipped nursery provided opportunities for babies to take part in external community activities.

⁴⁹ HM Prison Service (2000). *The management of mother and baby units*, Prison Service Order 4801.

Health services

- 4.63 Women who had used prison health services were more likely to report the overall quality of individual services and health services as good in 2006–08 than in 2003–05 (see table 13). However, women's perceptions and inspection report findings varied across prisons. At Eastwood Park health services were very good with nurse triage and access to a variety of in-house clinics, including sexual health. The introduction of a non-medical practice manager and administrative staff was innovative, replicating provision in the community, and worked well. At Peterborough a new management structure was working more effectively. The overall service had improved but perceptions of the quality of health care were still very poor. A better health care applications system was needed to ensure quicker access to appointments. Send's health services were the biggest source of women's complaints. Here they were heavily reliant on agency staff and there was no permanent manager. At Bronzefield some services, such as hepatitis B vaccinations, were not delivered as they were not specified in the contract.

Table 14: Health services – women's survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from them is good/very good?		
The doctor	56%	41%
The nurse	65%	56%
The dentist	43%	36%
The overall quality of health services	49%	33%

- 4.64 In 2006–08 only a third of the women surveyed said that it was easy to see the doctor, and long waits to see a doctor were mentioned in several inspection reports. In contrast, 60% of women said that it was easy to see a nurse. However, some inspection reports noted that where there was a nurse triage system this was not well explained, so women thought they were prevented from seeing the doctor. At Low Newton women could use a phone appointment line to access primary services.
- 4.65 Two-thirds (67%) of women in 2006–08 reported that they were taking medication at the time of the survey. Of the women who were taking medication, half (51%) were allowed to keep their medication in their cell. Forty per cent of women said that it was easy to see a pharmacist. Inspection reports raised some concerns at individual prisons about dispensing arrangements or the approach to medication in possession. There were significant concerns at Eastwood Park about the management of medicines. There was no on-site pharmacy support, and little input from the pharmacist, which was a particular issue given the large amount of controlled drugs held in the prison. Styal had poor arrangements for dispensing medication, whereas at Morton Hall there was an innovative trial under way using dispensing machines for simple medications.
- 4.66 Only 15% of women said that it was easy to see the dentist. This was supported by inspection reports, which demonstrated that, although dental services had improved, at several prisons the waiting lists were still too long.

- 4.67 There were some examples of good antenatal care at Askham Grange, Bronzefield and Holloway. There were also some examples of good health promotion, such as the excellent initiative at Askham Grange inviting women to attend weekend well-being sessions. At Downview health promotion was linked to national initiatives.
- 4.68 At some prisons chronic disease management needed improving. There was no breast screening at Drake Hall, and at Morton Hall the latest health needs assessment did not reflect the recent increase in the number of women with chronic conditions.

Mental health

- 4.69 Half (49%) of the women surveyed in 2006–08 said they had an emotional well-being or mental health issue. Those with problems were most likely to report receiving help from a doctor or the mental health in-reach team, although 14% said that they were not receiving any help. A third (34%) reported that they were seeing a counsellor.

Table 15: Mental health – women's survey results for 2006–08

	2006–08
Do you feel you have any emotional well-being/mental health issues?	49%
For those with emotional well-being/mental health issues, are these being addressed by any of the following?	
Not receiving any help	14%
A doctor	47%
A nurse	29%
A psychiatrist	27%
The mental health in-reach team	48%
A counsellor	34%

- 4.70 As reported in the Inspectorate's mental health thematic,⁵⁰ primary mental health services needed development. At the Bronzefield inspection there was no primary mental health care. At Holloway women with mild to moderate mental health needs were under the care of the community mental health team and also had access to good psychological and counselling services, but there were no primary mental health nurses. At Peterborough resources for primary mental health care were stretched. At Low Newton, although services were mostly satisfactory, there were no day care services and limited counselling provision.
- 4.71 Secondary mental health provision was generally better. The Drake Hall mental health in-reach team provided a good multidisciplinary service for those with severe conditions. Eastwood Park had good mental health provision with a strong and developing team that had established excellent relationships with residential staff. The services at Styal were good but not sufficient to meet the high level of need. Likewise at Send, staff were stretched. New Hall mental health services were generally good but the inpatient unit was usually full of mental health patients,

⁵⁰ HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2007). *Op.cit.*

so there was no provision for women with physical health needs. At Foston Hall, mental health transfers took too long and some of these women were inappropriately held in segregation.

5. Purposeful activity

Overview: healthy prison assessments for purposeful activity

Table 16: Purposeful activity assessments for women's prisons between 2003 and 2009⁵¹

Prison	Functional type	Year of inspection	Purposeful activity assessment
Askham Grange	Open	2004	Not performing sufficiently well
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2008	Performing well
Bronzefield	Local	2005	Performing well
		2007	Performing reasonably well
Downview	Trainer	2003	Not performing sufficiently well
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
Drake Hall	Semi-open	2004	Performing reasonably well
		2007	Performing reasonably well
Eastwood Park	Local	2003	Performing reasonably well
		2006	Not performing sufficiently well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
East Sutton Park	Open	2003	/
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2009	Performing well
Foston Hall	Local	2004	Performing well
		2007	Performing reasonably well
		2009	Performing reasonably well
Holloway	Local	2004	Performing reasonably well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
Low Newton	Local	2003	/
		2006	Performing well
		2009	Performing well
Morton Hall	Semi-open	2003	Not performing sufficiently well
		2005	Performing reasonably well
		2007	Performing well
New Hall	Local	2003	Not performing sufficiently well
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
Peterborough	Local	2006	Not performing sufficiently well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
Send	Trainer	2006	Performing reasonably well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
Styal	Local	2004	Not performing sufficiently well
		2005	Performing poorly (remand wing), Performing reasonably well (rest of the prison)
		2008	Performing reasonably well

⁵¹ Assessments for each healthy prison test were introduced during 2004, although some prisons inspected before this date were assessed retrospectively. All assessments have been included where they exist.

- 5.1 Since 2003, the majority of prisons had improved or maintained reasonable performance in this healthy prison test. In the most recent inspection:
- Four prisons were assessed as performing well: Askham Grange, East Sutton Park, Morton Hall and Low Newton (two open prisons, one semi-open and one local prison). For all bar Low Newton this was an improved assessment from performing reasonably well in their previous inspection. These prisons had sufficient activities, with good education and training and time out of cell. Library, physical education and gym provision were all good.
 - The other 10 women's prisons were performing reasonably well. For two of the local prisons, Eastwood Park and Peterborough, this was an improved assessment and at Styal this was an improved assessment for the remand wing which was now performing in line with the rest of the prison. Across these 10 prisons time out of cell was reasonably good. However, there was a need for more formal accreditation to be offered, and at some prisons not all jobs were good quality.
- 5.2 One prison's assessment had slipped – at Bronzefield although time out of cell was still mostly good, there had been problems and staffing shortages had meant that some activities had been curtailed. The inspection report noted concerns about plans to reduce time out of cell.

Time out of cell

- 5.3 Across women's prisons time out of cell was reasonable, although few prisons met our expectation of 10 hours a day out of cell. In surveys only a quarter of women reported spending 10 hours or more out of their cells in 2006–08, a similar proportion to 2003–05. Percentages were highest at the two open prisons. At Foston Hall time out of cell was good and very few women were locked behind their doors even when they had no activity to attend. At Eastwood Park time out of cell was good for a local prison but did not meet 10 hours. Women, whether they worked or not, were unlocked for most of the day but over half the prisoners were on the wing during the core day and, apart from a small number of wing cleaners, were not involved in purposeful activity.

Table 17: Time out of cell – women's survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
On average, do you spend 10 or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	25%	23%
On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	44%	44%
On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	55%	51%

- 5.4 In both 2006–08 and 2003–05, 44% of women surveyed reported going outside for exercise three or more times a week. In the Downview inspection report there was good time in the open air during the summer, but it was unclear what arrangements there were for daily exercise in winter. There was poor access to the open air at Low Newton – exercise was offered first thing in the morning with little take up. At New Hall exercise was rarely cancelled but there was no exercise period for women in full-time activity.
- 5.5 More women in 2006–08 reported daily association, but this was still relatively low at 55%. At the New Hall inspection women were not allowed to associate in cells and were locked in their cells if they wanted to smoke, which meant many chose not to come out. Staff shortages

meant evening association was often cancelled. Likewise, staffing difficulties at Low Newton had led to association periods being cancelled.

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.6 More women in 2006–08 than in 2003–05 said that they had had a job or been involved in vocational or skills training or education while in prison (see Table 18). In 2006–08, women who said they had been involved in activities in prison were more positive about these being helpful to them on release than in 2003–05.

Table 18: Learning and skills and work activities – women's survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
Have you had a job while in prison?	80%	74%
Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in prison?	67%	62%
Have you been involved in education while in prison?	78%	71%

Education and training

- 5.7 The management of education was good at most prisons. At Eastwood Park there was a meticulous use of management information, and feedback from prisoners had led to changes. At New Hall there was a clear strategy to increase the range and levels of the learning and skills provision, and progress on actions for improvement were monitored in an annual learning and skills development plan.
- 5.8 The allocation of women to activities varied. Styal had an initial assessment on arrival which was used by information, advice and guidance (IAG) workers to allocate women to appropriate places. Sentence plan targets were also taken into account. At East Sutton Park initial assessments were linked to sentence and learning plans. However, at most other prisons assessments were not always used to allocate women.
- 5.9 At some prisons education capacity was underused and there were examples where pay for education was a disincentive. For example, at Holloway most jobs paid more than education.
- 5.10 At most prisons the quality of teaching was satisfactory or good, with a range of courses available. At Askham Grange, Ofsted assessed the quality of provision, teaching and achievement as outstanding, the first time this grade had been given in a prison. However, at some prisons there was a need to provide courses that better matched the needs of the population, and several required greater provision of English for speakers of other languages (ESOL). For example, Eastwood Park offered a variety of courses and numeracy, literacy and employability skills were good. Provision for Welsh-speaking prisoners was good, but two ESOL lessons a week per group did not meet the needs of Vietnamese and Chinese-speaking prisoners and there was a need for appropriate activities for longer-term prisoners, many of whom were young adults. At Foston Hall there was a range of courses but they were more limited for remand women. At Styal, although the short length of stay for many women meant that few got full qualifications, they were able to complete units.

Work

- 5.11 As with education, the allocation of women to jobs was not always based on assessed needs and preferences. For example, at Drake Hall allocation to work was not systematic and, as with allocation to education, IAG records did not support the process. At New Hall, by contrast, the allocation process to jobs and other activities was fair and effectively used information from IAG sessions to meet preferences and needs. At Peterborough there had been significant improvements in induction and the use of information to guide allocation to activities, with an emphasis on developing employability and work skills.
- 5.12 At most prisons there were sufficient places for the population. However, at Peterborough there were insufficient work opportunities to keep women actively employed full time, although more participated through part-time activity. At Send there were some gaps in activities and no extra resources had been provided to occupy a larger population with the new accommodation. Many women only worked part time.
- 5.13 The range of work and adequacy of accreditation opportunities varied across prisons. Askham Grange had over 40 women in paid work or engaged in voluntary placements in the community. The range and quality of these had improved. There were sufficient activity and work places to meet the needs of the population. Foston Hall had a reasonable range of work with some opportunities for accreditation. However, remand women had more limited opportunities. Low Newton had sufficient places and a range of training courses had been introduced with a focus on employment skills. At Peterborough there was little formally accredited vocational training, and at Send no qualifications were available in the workshops. At Styal there was a need for more accredited work, especially for lifers and those with longer stays.

Library

- 5.14 In the survey, nearly half (48%) the women in 2006–08 reported going to the library at least once a week compared with 43% in 2003–05. Inspection reports also noted that access to the library was good at most prisons. However, not all prisons offered evening or weekend access and at some prisons space in the library was limited, with little room for private study. At the Low Newton inspection there was good use of the 'learning shop'.
- 5.15 Most libraries stocked a good range of materials. However, this did not always include legal and Prison Service information, books to support education and training, or books and newspapers for foreign national women. There was no internet access at any prison, including the open prisons, to help with education, job searches, and other resettlement issues, although at East Sutton Park some internet sessions were run at the local public library.

Physical education and health promotion

- 5.16 At most prisons there were good gyms, although not all prisons had outside facilities. Over a third (38%) of the women in 2006–08 said that they went to the gym at least twice a week, compared with 26% in 2003–05. This was supported by inspection reports, which reported improved access and participation. However, some prisons had problems due to staff shortages. At Bronzefield staff shortages had meant that gym provision had reduced, and Send had been short-staffed for 18 months, which had affected recreational classes.

- 5.17 Most prisons offered a range of activities and at least some qualifications or accreditation. For example, Holloway had a varied programme that matched a wide range of needs, including those of older prisoners, and Styal ran specific sessions for substance misusers. At Downview some accredited programmes had recently been introduced, such as the community sports leadership award and healthy living.
- 5.18 Morton Hall promoted healthy living through a course run by PE staff, New Hall promoted PE and healthy living reasonably well, and Peterborough ran healthy lifestyle programmes, with formal links between health care and gym staff. Styal needed to do more to promote healthy lifestyles.

Faith and religious activity

- 5.19 Just under two-thirds of women said that they felt their religious beliefs were respected in 2006–08 and 2003–05. However, in 2006–08 fewer women said that they could speak to a religious leader of their faith in private (see table 19). At Send there was no permanent part-time assistant, which meant that the chaplain conducted administrative tasks, limiting contact with women. At Eastwood Park all new arrivals were seen by a chaplain and given written information about the work of the chaplaincy team.

Table 19: Faith – women's survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	60%	62%
Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	60%	64%

- 5.20 Inspection reports showed that there was a wide range of chaplains at most prisons to cater for most faiths. At Eastwood Park there were no Buddhist or Muslim faith leaders but this gap had been acknowledged and steps were being taken to recruit them. At most prisons there was good access to services, although at New Hall and Styal there were clashes between services and medication times, and at Peterborough women were still required to make an application to attend religious services in advance, and services were disturbed by gym activities.
- 5.21 At most prisons the chaplaincy teams were well integrated and involved in a range of work. For example, at Styal the chaplaincy ran a mother and toddler group and offered bereavement counselling. Drake Hall chaplains were involved in a range of work, including attending ACCT reviews.

6. Resettlement

Overview: healthy prison assessments for resettlement

Table 20: Resettlement assessments for women's prisons between 2003 and 2009⁵²

Prison	Functional type	Year of inspection	Resettlement assessments
Askham Grange	Open	2004	Performing reasonably well
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2008	Performing well
Bronzefield	Local	2005	Not performing sufficiently well
		2007	Performing reasonably well
Downview	Trainer	2003	Not performing sufficiently well
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
Drake Hall	Semi-open	2004	Not performing sufficiently well
		2007	Not performing sufficiently well
Eastwood Park	Local	2003	Performing poorly
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
East Sutton Park	Open	2003	/
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2009	Performing reasonably well
Foston Hall	Local	2004	Not performing sufficiently well
		2007	Not performing sufficiently well
		2009	Not performing sufficiently well
Holloway	Local	2004	Performing reasonably well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
Low Newton	Local	2003	/
		2006	Performing reasonably well
		2009	Performing reasonably well
Morton Hall	Semi-open	2003	Not performing sufficiently well
		2005	Performing reasonably well
		2007	Performing reasonably well
New Hall	Local	2003	Not performing sufficiently well
		2006	Not performing sufficiently well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
Peterborough	Local	2006	Not performing sufficiently well
		2008	Not performing sufficiently well
Send	Trainer	2006	Performing reasonably well
		2008	Performing reasonably well
Styal	Local	2004	Performing reasonably well
		2005	Performing reasonably well
		2008	Performing reasonably well

⁵² Assessments for each healthy prison test were introduced during 2004, although some prisons inspected before this date were assessed retrospectively. All assessments have been included where they exist.

- 6.1 Since 2003, the majority of prisons had improved or maintained reasonable assessments against this healthy prison test. In the most recent inspection:
- Askham Grange was the only women's prison to be assessed as performing well on resettlement. This was an improvement on the two previous inspection assessments of reasonably well. In 2008 there was an appropriate pathway-based resettlement strategy, and offender management and sentence planning arrangements worked well. Reintegration services were good and there was some excellent family support work.
 - Ten prisons were performing reasonably well. For two local prisons, Bronzefield and New Hall, this was an improved assessment from the previous inspection. Issues to be addressed included the need for custody planning for women on remand and those serving less than 12 months. At East Sutton Park some women arrived with too little time left to serve to benefit from the resettlement opportunities.
 - Three prisons were not performing sufficiently well and assessments had not improved since their previous inspection: Drake Hall, Foston Hall and Peterborough. Drake Hall had no clear case management and the resettlement strategy did not clearly identify the needs of all groups of women held there. Many women did not have up-to-date sentence plans and there was no family support worker. At Foston Hall resettlement pathways needed further development, as did work with children and families. There was a need to adapt the provision for women serving shorter sentences and women on remand. Peterborough had no short-term custody planning for the many women who stayed for short periods. Although the prison now operated as a first-stage lifer centre, provision to meet the specific needs of young adult women and life-sentenced women was inadequate and needed developing.
- 6.2 Although no prisons had slipped in their performance for resettlement, most had more work to do to meet the specific resettlement needs of women.

Strategic management of resettlement

- 6.3 The majority of prison inspection reports noted that there was a resettlement strategy, except at Styal where there was none. At Morton Hall the policy was out of date. Peterborough had no formal resettlement strategy, although reducing reoffending plans took into account the resettlement pathways and provided strategic direction. At East Sutton Park the strategy covered men at Blantyre House and there was insufficient attention to the specific needs of women. Several prison strategies were not informed by a needs analysis, and strategies did not always cover the needs of particular groups, such as young adults, foreign nationals, remand or short-sentenced women and lifers. Not all strategies included the two additional pathways suggested by the NOMS women and young people's group – supporting women who have experienced abuse or been involved in prostitution – and therefore work in these areas needed further development.
- 6.4 Regular policy committees (or equivalent) were used to coordinate and drive resettlement work forward. However, at a couple of prisons there was too much focus on day-to-day delivery rather than strategic issues.
- 6.5 The change of function of several prisons from women to men meant that some were dealing with women held further away from home. Eastwood Park covered a wide geographical area and received women from over 70 courts. This caused significant problems in meeting their

resettlement needs. At Holloway the need for a national strategic direction for the women's estate as a whole and clarification of the specific role of Holloway within that, particularly in providing a resettlement function for women from London, had hindered the revision of the resettlement strategy.

- 6.6 Sentenced women were more likely to report that they had a sentence plan in 2006–08 than in 2003–05, although this was still relatively low at 55%. More women in 2006–08 said they were involved in the development of their plan (see table 21). In 2006–08 only 27% of women said that a member of staff had helped prepare them for release, and fewer than half (44%) of sentenced women felt that a member of staff had helped them to address their offending behaviour.

Table 21: Sentence planning – women's survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
For those who are sentenced:		
Do you have a sentence plan?	55%	48%
For those with a sentence plan:		
Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	72%	61%

- 6.7 Only 27% of sentenced women serving less than 12 months reported that they had a sentence or custody plan compared with 64% of women serving more than 12 months. This was supported by findings from inspections, with most prisons either having no or insufficient sentence or custody planning for women serving less than 12 months. However, at Askham Grange women serving short-term sentences were set targets at initial boards, with the main focus on interventions overseen by staff in the pathways department. Drake Hall had plans to develop a traffic lights passport scheme to assess all resettlement needs, although at the time of inspection there was nothing in place for short-sentenced women. At local women's prisons reports also noted either no or insufficient custody planning for women on remand.
- 6.8 Several prisons had a backlog in offender assessment system (OASys) assessments, sentence planning boards were not always multidisciplinary, and for women covered by offender management, there were often problems with offender managers being able to attend boards. Over 60% of women at Drake Hall who should have had an up-to-date OASys assessment did not have one, although some should have been completed at sending establishments. At Downview most OASys assessments were up to date although many women arrived without one. Clear targets were set at boards and women were encouraged to participate. However, sentence planning meetings were not always attended by a wide range of staff and few offender managers were able to attend, although the use of teleconferencing and video link facilities was being introduced. Styal only held sentence planning boards when offender managers could attend, so there was a significant backlog.
- 6.9 Of the women who had a sentence plan, 85% said they could achieve some or all of their targets in their current prison and 37% had plans to achieve targets in another prison. Due to changes in the women's estate, moves from Bronzefield were difficult, with moves being mainly to Morton Hall or Peterborough. In contrast, at Peterborough opportunities for women to move to lower category prisons had improved and more were moving to open and semi-open conditions.

Indeterminate-sentenced women

- 6.10 In surveys, women serving an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP) or life sentence were more likely to say that they had a personal officer and a sentence plan than other sentenced women. They were less likely to report that they had been involved in the development of their plan or that they could achieve all their targets at their current prison, but more likely to report that there were plans for them to achieve some of their targets in other prisons. Women serving an indeterminate sentence were more likely than other sentenced women to report that a member of staff had helped them with their offending behaviour, and to feel that they had done something, or that something had happened to them in prison, to make them less likely to reoffend.
- 6.11 Most inspection reports noted that lifer reports were up to date, but there was insufficient information for those serving indeterminate sentences for public protection. Few prisons offered regular lifer days, lifer groups or surgeries. There was some good support for lifers at Drake Hall: sentence plans were up to date with active resettlement targets, all personal officers were also trained lifer officers, and a new buddy scheme had been introduced to help new lifers with the transition to a more relaxed and open environment. However, there had been no lifer days since September 2005 and there were no organised lifer groups. Although Peterborough now operated as a first-stage centre for women lifers, this had not been well planned or resourced. The provision did not reflect that found in other first-stage lifer prisons, and the lifers felt frustrated with their position and insufficient support from specialist staff.

Resettlement pathways

- 6.12 From the survey, an improved 59% of sentenced women in 2006–08 felt that they had done something or something had happened to them to make them less likely to offend in the future, compared with 51% in 2003–05.
- 6.13 Inspection reports noted that the identification of resettlement needs varied, in addition to links to the relevant services. For example, at Downview there was no system to ensure that those who needed specific services were identified and prioritised, and at Drake Hall assessment of needs on arrival was inadequate, particularly for women who did not speak English. At Eastwood Park reintegration needs were identified at induction and through information, advice and guidance (IAG) workers. Pathway leads were identified and the interconnectivity of areas was good, with good use of voluntary sector groups. Bimonthly resettlement fairs provided information about the services available, and weekly drop-in clinics on the wings made reintegration services more accessible, although they clashed with other activities. At Peterborough immediate needs were better identified through Connexions workers and the Link resettlement services. A pre-release course covered a wide range of areas, but at six weeks long was not suitable for many women.
- 6.14 Women were very positive about the therapeutic community at Send, the only therapeutic community unit for women. At the time of inspection, the population was limited to 20, due to staffing shortages, although there was space for 40. Send's location hindered recruitment to the therapeutic community, and there was a need for more central support for and direction of the community.

Accommodation

- 6.15 In 2006–08, 44% of women said that they would have a problem finding accommodation on release.
- 6.16 At several prisons, inspectors noted that few women were recorded as leaving without accommodation, although inspections did not assess the accommodation being accessed and whether it was suitable or sustainable. At Askham Grange an effective accommodation service was run by a trained staff member and one trained peer adviser. Virtually no women left without accommodation, and some good links had been established with the ClearSprings service to provide accommodation for women on home detention curfew and women with babies. Eastwood Park also had good accommodation services: all women were seen on arrival, and there were four housing orderlies trained to offer support.
- 6.17 However, this was not true for all prisons. For example, at New Hall help for women to obtain housing on release was restricted as there was a vacancy for a housing adviser and only limited cover from another prison. Likewise, at Peterborough the accommodation service was stretched due to the absence of the accommodation adviser because of sickness and inadequate cover. At Downview, although trained staff and a peer worker provided housing support and advice, not all women received the initial accommodation screening.

Education, training and employment

- 6.18 In 2006–08, 33% of women said that they thought they would have a problem continuing education and 55% said that they would have a problem finding a job on release.
- 6.19 Not all prisons offered an employability pre-release course and there were often insufficient links with local employers and colleges to help women find employment or continue education. At Drake Hall there was some positive work on this pathway, although some areas required improvement. There were some opportunities in the community for women to develop skills to prepare for education and employment on release, and 39 women went out to work or college regularly. Many of the placements offered opportunities for jobs on release and the prison had good links with employers. Careers advice was provided monthly by Next Steps, and Jobcentre Plus attended the prison two days a week to help with employment advice. There was also a five-day employability pre-release programme, but this was not well promoted or used.

Mental and physical health

- 6.20 In 2006–08 a quarter of women said that they thought they would have a problem accessing health services on release.
- 6.21 Both Drake Hall and Morton Hall inspections noted that all women were seen by the GP before release and were given a summary letter for their community GP. Women on medication were given at least a seven-day supply. Eastwood Park had reasonable health care pre-release systems, which were linked in with offender management. However, at some prisons women without a GP needed more help to register.
- 6.22 Women managed under the care programme approach (CPA) by the mental health in-reach team (MHIRT) benefited from better links to community mental health services. At Eastwood Park, the team social worker coordinated pre-release work with relevant community mental

health teams for those under the care of the MHIRT. However, the CPA does not apply to women with primary mental health needs, and across prisons links to community services were often poorer for these women or limited to a summary letter for their GP. Positively, at Holloway some women involved in counselling were able to continue it after release.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 6.23 In 2006–08, 45% of women said that they thought they would have a problem with money and finances and 38% that they would have problems accessing benefits on release.
- 6.24 There were examples in reports of some positive work in this pathway, but assistance for women with debt problems was often limited. At Askham Grange money management courses were run and women were helped to open bank accounts and apply for benefits and grants. At Eastwood Park finance-related services were generally good, particularly the support in setting up bank accounts, but there was no provision for debt management. At East Sutton Park the Vision service provided some help with finance problems, but support from Citizens Advice and JobCentre Plus was no longer available.

Drugs and alcohol

- 6.25 All prisons had a drug strategy, but they were not always up to date or based on a needs analysis. Of concern, there was rarely an alcohol policy. Holloway had a comprehensive drug strategy, with a section on the particular needs of young adults. At Askham Grange there was a drug strategy and an alcohol policy. Monthly strategy meetings were well led and well attended and included local drug and alcohol action team representatives. In contrast, New Hall had a disjointed drug strategy and there were infrequent meetings. At Peterborough the drug strategy was one of the few policies that still covered the men's and women's prisons, and it did not adequately reflect the specific and different needs of the women prisoners.
- 6.26 CARATs workers provided some good services. At Drake Hall the CARAT service was accessible and offered structured individual and group work and also helped women whose main problem was with alcohol. However, at some prisons services were stretched and not all offered support to women who were primary problem alcohol users.
- 6.27 There was a range of courses across prisons, including P-ASRO (prison – addressing substance related offending) and SDP (short duration drug programme). However, not all prisons were able to offer one-to-one work and group work, and services for primary problem alcohol users were often limited to alcohol awareness classes or Alcoholics Anonymous, and not all courses had been adapted for women. Most prisons also offered voluntary drug testing (VDT). Morton Hall had effective VDT open to all and good support on the identified VDT landing. At New Hall over 90 women were subject to voluntary drug testing, but in practice very few tests were done.
- 6.28 Send had a RAPt (Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust) unit, which women were positive about. The course was well run by motivated and involved staff. However, the use of shared accommodation for those participating in the course was a barrier for some women. At Drake Hall the former drug rehabilitation programme was now a drug therapeutic community (TC) that was awaiting accreditation. This was skilfully run but there was a need to establish whether the provision best matched needs.
- 6.29 In 2006–08 fewer women thought they would have a problem with drugs or alcohol on release (28% and 21% respectively) than in 2003–05. However, of the women who reported a drug

problem on arrival in 2006–08, 62% felt they would have a drug problem on release and 64% of women reporting an alcohol problem on arrival felt they would have an alcohol problem on release.

- 6.30 In both survey periods, two-thirds of women who reported a potential drug or alcohol problem on release said they knew who to approach in the prison for help contacting external drug or alcohol agencies on release. Inspection reports indicated good throughcare links to community drug intervention programme workers.

Children and families of offenders

- 6.31 Women are often held far from home due to the limited number and location of women's prisons. This makes it more difficult for family and friends to visit, although this is recognised as important for aiding resettlement and well-being, and is particularly important for women with children. In the surveys in both 2006–08 and 2003–05, just over a third of women reported that they had received a visit in the first week, and almost three quarters of women (70%) said that the prison gave them the opportunity to have the visits to which they were entitled. In the surveys for 2006–08, a third of women (34%) said that they had received at least one visit in the previous week.
- 6.32 Fifty-five per cent of women surveyed in 2006–08 said that they had children under the age of 18. Of these women, only 38% reported that they had received a visit during their first week at their current prison, and 58% said they had not received a visit in the previous week.
- 6.33 Just over a third of women in 2006–08 said that they had had problems sending or receiving mail, and a quarter that they had had problems getting access to phones, although this was an improvement on 2003–05. Just over half (56%) of women in 2006–08 reported that they had been helped with maintaining contact with family or friends in their current prison.

Table 22: Family contact – women's survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	36%	36%
Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to (e.g. number and length of visit)?	70%	71%
Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	37%	35%
Have you had any problems getting access to the phones?	24%	29%

- 6.34 At several prisons it was difficult for visitors to book visits by phone. At Bronzefield, although there was phone or email booking for visits, only visitors to remand women could book the next visit while at the prison. At Morton Hall pre-booked space was often not used, denying other women the opportunity. At New Hall visitors said it was difficult to get through to the booking line. Additionally, at several prisons visits did not start on time.
- 6.35 At some prisons there was no visitors' centre or provision of transport. For example, there was no centre or community bus at Eastwood Park, although many visitors had to travel long distances, and at Drake Hall there was just a waiting cabin outside the gate. In contrast, at Holloway a good visitors' centre run by PACT continued to provide information and support.

- 6.36 At many prisons the visits halls were comfortable and welcoming, but children's play areas were not always supervised. All women's prisons held children's days and there were examples of positive work to help women maintain contact with their children. At Askham Grange the good family work included the use of a house in the prison grounds for overnight visits with family members, and an accredited family learning programme. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was also well used to help women maintain family contact. Downview ran regular children and baby days, made good use of ROTL, and used two flats just outside the prison for women to spend time with their children and rebuild relationships. At Morton Hall a helpful social services initiative provided visits for children in local authority care. However, at some prisons not enough was done to support women to maintain contact with their children. At Foston Hall there were insufficient weekend visits and no evening visits, and at Eastwood Park family days were limited to women on one wing or the mother and baby unit.
- 6.37 Over half (55%) of women said that they had children under the age of 18. Being separated from their children and the problems this causes women are often hidden and unrecognised. Despite this, most prisons did not have a qualified family support worker, although at Askham Grange all women were seen individually at induction by a family support worker, and at Eastwood Park family contact was also supported by a family liaison officer. Some prisons offered some form of parenting course and some had links with voluntary services to help women. For example, at Downview a childcare programme was run by education, and Action for Prisoners' Families worked with the prison to provide support for prisoners with adoption and family court issues. At Eastwood Park parent craft courses were run by the education department and women could send out story tapes.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 6.38 In the surveys for 2006–08, more respondents than in 2003–05 said that they had participated in offending behaviour programmes and, for those who had, that they would be beneficial on release.

Table 23: Offending behaviour programmes – women's survey results comparing 2006–08 and 2003–05

	2006–08	2003–05
Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in prison?	59%	52%
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in prison:		
Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	63%	46%

- 6.39 Insufficient offending behaviour programmes designed or adapted to meet the specific needs of women is a national issue. In addition, inspections found that provision of programmes was not always based on a needs analysis to ensure the needs of the population, including particular groups such as young adults, short-sentenced women and lifers, were met.
- 6.40 Provision at individual prisons varied. At Askham Grange offending behaviour programmes were not routinely run in the prison, but North Yorkshire probation staff occasionally delivered the Think First programme and women could attend community-based programmes. Probation staff provided some individual victim awareness work. Morton Hall had a range of interventions, but some women were unable to participate as they were not fluent enough in English. Low Newton ran a range of courses and the Primrose Project for women with severe personality disorders had begun there.

Appendix I: Methodology

This report covers all 14 women's prisons in England and Wales.⁵³ Findings refer only to the adult and young adult populations held at these prisons and exclude the four units for girls aged 18 and under.

The findings come from two main sources: the inspection reports and the surveys.

Inspection reports

An analysis of the healthy prison summaries from published inspection reports was conducted. This included findings from 37 inspections between February 2003 and September 2009. The following table details the inspections included in the analysis, as well as the type of inspection.

Prison	Date of inspection	Type of inspection
Askham Grange	15 March 2004	Full announced
	25 April 2006	Short follow-up
	29 September 2008	Full announced
Bronzefield	13 June 2005	Full announced
	1 October 2007	Short follow-up
Downview	9 June 2003	Full announced
	3 July 2006	Short follow-up
	12 May 2008	Full announced
Drake Hall	31 August 2004	Full follow-up
	3 September 2007	Full announced
Eastwood Park	22 September 2003	Full announced
	7 March 2006	Short follow-up
	13 October 2008	Full announced
East Sutton Park	21 July 2003	Short follow-up
	13 November 2006	Full announced
	13 July 2009	Short follow-up
Foston Hall	10 May 2004	Full announced
	1 May 2007	Short follow-up
	28 September 2009	Full announced
Holloway	4 October 2004	Full unannounced
	5 March 2008	Full follow-up
Low Newton	7 July 2003	Short follow-up
	3 April 2006	Full announced
	20 April 2009	Short follow-up
Morton Hall	3 February 2003	Full announced
	5 September 2005	Short follow-up
	19 November 2007	Full announced
New Hall	10 November 2003	Full announced
	20 March 2006	Short follow-up
	10 November 2008	Full announced

⁵³ As this report comments on the performance of the current 14 women's prisons, inspection reports and survey data for women's prisons that have since re-rolled to hold male prisoners have been excluded from the analysis.

Peterborough	2 October 2006	Full announced
	30 June 2008	Short follow-up
Send	13 February 2006	Full announced
	18 August 2008	Short follow-up
Styal	19 January 2004	Full unannounced
	26 October 2005	Full follow-up
	1 September 2008	Full announced

As an overview, the healthy prison summary details how each prison is performing against the Inspectorate's four tests of a healthy prison: safety, respect, purposeful activity and resettlement. Assessments are also given for each of these tests on a rating of one to four:⁵⁴

'... performing well against this healthy prison test. (4)

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

... performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test. (3)

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

... not performing sufficiently well against this healthy prison test. (2)

There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of prisoners.

Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.

... performing poorly against this healthy prison test. (1)

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.'

This is done for both full and follow-up inspections.

Surveys

For all full inspections, including full follow-ups, a random and representative sample of the prison population is surveyed to give them the chance to comment on their treatment and the conditions in which they are held. The results from these surveys form part of the triangulated evidence base of our inspection findings. Findings from 21 surveys conducted at women's prisons were analysed for this report. This represented responses from 1,820 women.

Survey data are weighted to mimic the whole population at each establishment. All the figures in the comparator tables are weighted data. Missing data, where respondents have not answered a question, have been excluded from the analysis.

Survey data has been analysed in two ways:

- a comparison between the 1,099 survey responses collected from 2006 to 2008 at 12 women's prisons and the 721 survey responses collected at nine women's prisons from 2003 to 2005 – the full analysis is detailed in Appendix III.
- A comparison within the 1,099 2006 to 2008 survey results of:
 - o responses from black and minority ethnic women and white women

⁵⁴ See footnote 40 for rewording of these assessments from late 2009, after the scope of the reports surveyed for this thematic review.

- o responses from foreign national women and British women
- o responses from women aged 50 or over and those under 50
- o responses from those who considered themselves to have a disability and those who did not
- o responses from lesbian or bisexual women and heterosexual women
- o responses from young adult women (those aged under 21) and those 21 or above
- o responses from women sentenced to less than 12 months and those serving 12 months or more
- o responses from women serving an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP) or life sentence and all other sentenced women
- o responses from foreign national women at Drake Hall and Morton Hall and foreign national women at other prisons.

Appendix II: Healthy prison assessments for women's prisons 2003–09⁵⁵

Prison	Year of inspection	Safety assessment	Respect assessment	Purposeful activity assessment	Resettlement assessment
Askham Grange	2004	4	3	2	3
	2006	4	4	3	3
	2008	4	4	4	4
Bronzefield	2005	3	3	4	2
	2007	3	3	3	3
Downview	2003	3	3	2	2
	2006	3	3	3	3
	2008	3	3	3	3
Drake Hall	2004	4	3	3	2
	2007	4	3	3	2
Eastwood Park	2003	2	3	3	1
	2006	2	3	2	3
	2008	3	3	3	3
East Sutton Park	2003	/	/	/	/
	2006	4	3	3	3
	2009	4	3	4	3
Foston Hall	2004	4	3	4	2
	2007	3	3	3	2
	2009	3	3	3	2
Holloway	2004	2	2	3	3
	2008	2	3	3	3
Low Newton	2003	/	/	/	/
	2006	3	3	4	3
	2009	3	3	4	3
Morton Hall	2003	2	2	2	2
	2005	3	3	3	3
	2007	4	3	4	3
New Hall	2003	3	3	2	2
	2006	3	3	3	2
	2008	3	2	3	3
Peterborough	2006	2	2	2	2
	2008	3	2	3	2
Send	2006	4	4	3	3
	2008	2	3	3	3
Styal	2004	1	2	2	3
	2005	2	2	1 (remand wing) 3 (houses)	3
	2008	2	4	3	3

⁵⁵ Assessments for each healthy prison test were introduced during 2004, although some prisons inspected before this date were assessed retrospectively. All assessments have been included where they exist.

Appendix III: Profile of women surveyed

Respondents were asked to give some basic demographic information about themselves. Reported demographic details for both survey periods, 2003–05 and 2006–08, are detailed in the tables below. Where questions have been added since 2005 figures are only provided for 2006–08.

This information is not weighted, so that it directly reflects the demographic of our samples in each period. All missing data have been excluded and percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Status and sentence length

Table 1: Sentence length of women surveyed in 2003–05 and 2006–08

Sentence length	2003–05	2006–08
Not sentenced	29% (200)	14% (150)
12 months or less	23% (161)	18% (207)
One to two years	9% (61)	11% (118)
Two to four years	19% (133)	19% (207)
Four to 10 years	13% (92)	24% (254)
10 years or more	3% (19)	6% (67)
IPP	1% (6)	3% (29)
Life sentence	4% (26)	4% (40)

Previous experience of custody

Table 2: How many times women surveyed in 2003–05 and 2006–08 had been in prison before

Times in prison before	2003–05	2006–08
None	46% (326)	57% (566)
Once	13% (92)	13% (130)
Two to five times	22% (159)	17% (167)
More than five times	19% (132)	14% (136)

Age

Table 3: Age of women surveyed in 2003–05 and 2006–08

Age	2003–05	2006–08
Under 21	9% (60)	9% (97)
21 to 29	35% (248)	31% (333)
30 to 39	32% (224)	31% (332)
40 to 49	17% (122)	20% (220)
50 or over	8% (54)	9% (97)

Ethnicity

Table 4: Ethnicity of women surveyed in 2003–05 and 2006–08

Ethnicity	2003–05	2006–08
White	77% (547)	72% (775)
Black	14% (98)	16% (175)
Asian	1% (9)	3% (31)
Mixed heritage	5% (38)	7% (73)
Other	2% (15)	2% (24)

Nationality

Table 5: Nationality of women surveyed in 2003–05 and 2006–08

Nationality	2003–05	2006–08
British national	88% (612)	83% (889)
Foreign national	12% (84)	17% (178)

Disability

Fourteen per cent (117) of women considered themselves to have a disability.

Sexual orientation

Table 6: Sexual orientation of women surveyed in 2006–08

Sexual orientation	2006–08
Heterosexual	78% (695)
Lesbian/gay	18% (160)
Bisexual	4% (34)

Religion

Table 7: Religion of women surveyed in 2006–08

Religion	2006–08
None	24% (218)
Church of England	35% (323)
Catholic	21% (197)
Protestant	2% (14)
Other Christian denomination	8% (74)
Buddhist	3% (25)
Hindu	0% (3)
Jewish	0% (2)
Muslim	7% (62)
Sikh	0% (4)
Other	0% (5)

Appendix IV: Survey results



Appendix IV: Survey results - 2006-08 survey comparison with 2003-05

Key to tables

	Significantly better than the 2003-05 figure.		
	Significantly worse than the 2003-05 figure.		
	A significant difference in prisoners' background details.		
	No significant difference.		
		2006-08	2003-05
Number of completed questionnaires returned		1,099	721
SECTION 1: General information			
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	10%	9%
3a	Are you sentenced?	85%	76%
3b	Are you on recall?	6%	9%
4a	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	21%	25%
4b	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP)?	3%	1%
5	Do you have six months or less to serve?	44%	36%
6	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	24%	29%
7	Are you a foreign national?	18%	13%
8	Is English your first language?	87%	92%
9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	29%	24%
10	Are you Muslim?	7%	
11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	23%	
12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	14%	
13	Is this your first time in prison?	55%	44%
14	Have you been in more than five prisons this time?	3%	
15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	55%	60%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
For the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between prisons:			
1a	Was the cleanliness of the van good/very good?	48%	39%
1b	Was your personal safety during the journey good/very good?	60%	55%
1c	Was the comfort of the van good/very good?	15%	13%
1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	35%	31%
1e	Was the frequency of toilet breaks good/very good?	13%	11%
2	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	7%	9%
3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71%	72%
4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	81%	83%
4b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	16%	12%
4c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	84%	79%

Key to tables

	Significantly better than the 2003-05 figure.		
	Significantly worse than the 2003-05 figure.		
	A significant difference in prisoners' background details.		
	No significant difference.	2006-08	2003-05
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
1	In the first 24 hours, did staff ask you if you needed help/support with the following:		
1b	Problems with loss of property?	15%	
1c	Housing problems?	34%	
1d	Problems contacting employers?	14%	
1e	Problems contacting family?	64%	
1f	Problems ensuring dependants were looked after?	30%	
1g	Money problems?	18%	
1h	Problems of feeling depressed/suicidal?	62%	
1i	Health problems?	62%	
1j	Problems in needing protection from other prisoners?	17%	
1k	Problems accessing phone numbers?	49%	
2	When you first arrived:		
2a	Did you have any problems?	72%	81%
2b	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	11%	8%
2c	Did you have any housing problems?	23%	25%
2d	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	4%	2%
2e	Did you have any problems contacting family?	27%	27%
2f	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	8%	8%
2g	Did you have any money worries?	22%	25%
2h	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	32%	32%
2i	Did you have any health problems?	28%	32%
2j	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	5%	5%
2k	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	28%	
3a	Were you seen by a member of health services in reception?	85%	89%
3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	79%	76%
4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	75%	69%
5	On your day of arrival, were you offered any of the following information:		
5a	Information about what was going to happen to you?	50%	41%
5b	Information about what support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	49%	43%
5c	Information about how to make routine requests?	37%	30%
5d	Information about your entitlement to visits?	42%	36%
5e	Information about health services?	50%	
5f	Information about the chaplaincy?	50%	
6	On your day of arrival, were you offered any of the following:		
6a	A smokers/non-smokers pack?	82%	78%

Key to tables

	Significantly better than the 2003-05 figure.		
	Significantly worse than the 2003-05 figure.		
	A significant difference in prisoners' background details.		
	No significant difference.	2006-08	2003-05
6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	49%	41%
6c	The opportunity to make a free phone call?	68%	54%
6d	Something to eat?	79%	81%
7	Within the first 24 hours did you meet any of the following people:		
7a	The chaplain or a religious leader?	48%	48%
7b	Someone from health services?	76%	72%
7c	A Listener/Samaritans?	27%	32%
8	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	21%	26%
9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	74%	72%
10	Have you been on an induction course?	89%	84%
11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	64%	58%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
1	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
1a	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	43%	84%
1b	Attend legal visits?	57%	85%
1c	Obtain bail information?	24%	74%
2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	37%	45%
3	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
3a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	55%	59%
3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	89%	83%
3c	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	76%	85%
3d	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	72%	73%
3e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	36%	37%
3f	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	61%	58%
3g	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	33%	32%
4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	37%	27%
5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	45%	40%
6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	84%	82%
6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	87%	85%
7	Have you made an application?	83%	85%
For those who have made an application:			
8a	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	59%	64%
8b	Do you feel applications are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	50%	57%
9	Have you made a complaint?	51%	63%
For those who have made a complaint:			
10a	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	42%	52%

Key to tables

	Significantly better than the 2003-05 figure.		
	Significantly worse than the 2003-05 figure.		
	A significant difference in prisoners' background details.		
	No significant difference.	2006-08	2003-05
10b	Do you feel complaints are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	46%	49%
11	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	24%	22%
10c	Were you given information about how to make an appeal?	29%	41%
12	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	42%	36%
13a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	60%	62%
13b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	60%	64%
14	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	64%	73%
15a	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	80%	77%
15b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	71%	73%
SECTION 5: Safety			
1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	40%	33%
2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	14%	
4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	28%	24%
5	Since you have been here, has another prisoner:		
5a	Made insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends?	17%	13%
5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	4%
5c	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%
5d	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	4%
5e	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	4%
5f	Taken your canteen/property?	6%	7%
5g	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	7%
5h	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	2%	
5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	
5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	
5k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	3%
5l	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5%	
6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	21%	18%
7	Since you have been here, has a member of staff:		
7a	Made insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends?	10%	10%
7b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	2%
7c	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%
7d	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	2%
7e	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	3%
7f	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	3%
7g	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	2%	

Key to tables

	Significantly better than the 2003-05 figure.		
	Significantly worse than the 2003-05 figure.		
	A significant difference in prisoners' background details.		
	No significant difference.		
		2006-08	2003-05
7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	
7i	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	
7j	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	1%
7k	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	
For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:			
8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	48%	45%
9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	32%	38%
10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	22%	16%
11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	26%	23%
SECTION 6: Health services			
1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	33%	
1b	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	60%	
1c	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	15%	
1d	Is it easy/very easy to see the optician?	15%	
2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	40%	
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:			
3a	The doctor?	56%	41%
3b	The nurse?	65%	56%
3c	The dentist?	43%	36%
3d	The optician?	44%	32%
4	The overall quality of health services?	49%	33%
5	Are you currently taking medication?	67%	
For those currently taking medication:			
6	Are you allowed to keep possession of your medication in your own cell?	51%	
7	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	49%	
For those with emotional well-being/mental health issues, are these being addressed by any of the following:			
8a	Not receiving any help?	14%	
8b	A doctor?	47%	
8c	A nurse?	29%	
8d	A psychiatrist?	27%	
8e	The mental health in-reach team?	48%	
8f	A counsellor?	34%	
9a	Did you have a drug problem when you came into this prison?	30%	55%
9b	Did you have an alcohol problem when you came into this prison?	19%	21%
10a	Have you developed a drug problem since you have been in this prison?	14%	

Key to tables

	Significantly better than the 2003-05 figure.		
	Significantly worse than the 2003-05 figure.		
	A significant difference in prisoners' background details.		
	No significant difference.	2006-08	2003-05
10b	Have you developed an alcohol problem since you have been in this prison?	4%	
For those with drug or alcohol problems:			
11	Do you know who to contact in this prison for help?	86%	
12	Have you received any help or intervention while in this prison?	82%	
For those who have received help or intervention with their drug or alcohol problem:			
13	Was this intervention or help useful?	81%	
14a	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison (yes/don't know)?	28%	37%
14b	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison (yes/don't know)?	21%	23%
For those who may have a drug or alcohol problem on release, do you know who in this prison:			
15	Can help you contact external drug or alcohol agencies on release?	68%	67%
SECTION 7: Purposeful activity			
1	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
1a	A prison job?	53%	
1b	Vocational or skills training?	12%	
1c	Education (including basic skills)?	42%	
1d	Offending behaviour programmes?	17%	
2ai	Have you had a job while in prison?	80%	74%
For those who have had a prison job while in prison:			
2aii	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	57%	47%
2bi	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in prison?	67%	62%
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in prison:			
2bii	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	64%	54%
2ci	Have you been involved in education while in prison?	78%	71%
For those who have been involved in education while in prison:			
2cii	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	73%	62%
2di	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in prison?	59%	52%
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in prison:			
2dii	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	63%	46%
3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	48%	43%
4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	38%	26%
5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	44%	44%
6	On average, do you spend 10 or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	25%	23%
7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	55%	51%
8	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	23%	27%
SECTION 8: Resettlement			
1	Do you have a personal officer?	70%	50%
For those with a personal officer:			
2	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	69%	71%

Key to tables

	Significantly better than the 2003-05 figure.		
	Significantly worse than the 2003-05 figure.		
	A significant difference in prisoners' background details.		
	No significant difference.	2006-08	2003-05
For those who are sentenced:			
3	Do you have a sentence plan?	55%	48%
For those with a sentence plan?			
4	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	72%	61%
5	Can you achieve some/all of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	85%	
6	Are there plans for you to achieve some/all your targets in another prison?	37%	
For those who are sentenced:			
7	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you address your offending behaviour while at this prison?	44%	
8	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	27%	
9	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	37%	35%
10	Have you had any problems getting access to the phones?	24%	29%
11	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	36%	36%
12	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to (e.g. number and length of visit)?	70%	71%
13	Did you receive one or more visits in the last week?	34%	
14	Have you been helped to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	56%	
15	Do you know who to contact in this prison to get help with the following:		
15b	Maintaining good relationships?	23%	
15c	Avoiding bad relationships?	17%	
15d	Finding a job on release?	45%	69%
15e	Finding accommodation on release?	56%	76%
15f	With money/finances on release?	34%	63%
15g	Claiming benefits on release?	51%	75%
15h	Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	40%	65%
15i	Accessing health services on release?	40%	64%
15j	Opening a bank account on release?	30%	
16	Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following on release from prison:		
16b	Maintaining good relationships?	17%	
16c	Avoiding bad relationships?	24%	
16d	Finding a job?	55%	
16e	Finding accommodation?	44%	
16f	Money/finances?	45%	
16g	Claiming benefits?	38%	
16h	Arranging a place at college/continuing education?	33%	
16i	Accessing health services?	25%	
16j	Opening a bank account?	37%	
For those who are sentenced:			
17	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, to make you less likely to offend in future?	59%	51%

Appendix V: References

- Cabinet Office Social Exclusion Taskforce (2009). *Short study on women offenders*.
- Caddle, D. and Crisp, D. (1997). *Imprisoned women and mothers*, Home Office research study 162.
- Care Services Improvement Partnership (2007). *Positive practice, positive outcomes: A handbook for professionals in the criminal justice system working with offenders with learning disabilities*.
- Fawcett Commission on Women and the Criminal Justice System (2009). *Engendering justice – From policy to practice: Final report of the Commission on Women and the Criminal Justice System*.
- Hamlyn, B. and Lewis, D. (2000). *Women prisoners: A study of their work and training experiences in custody and on release*, Home Office research Study 208.
- Hibiscus (Female Prisoners Welfare Project, FPWP) <http://fpwphibiscus.org.uk>
- HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2010). *Annual report 2008–09*, London: HMIP.
- HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2006). *Women in prison: A literature review*, London: HMIP.
- HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2007). *The mental health of prisoners: A thematic review of the care and support of prisoners with mental health needs*, London: HMIP.
- HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2009). *Disabled prisoners: A short thematic review on the care and support of prisoners with a disability*, London: HMIP.
- HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2010). *Alcohol services in prisons: An unmet need*, London: HMIP.
- HM Prison Service (2000). *The management of mother and baby units*, Prison Service Order 4801.
- HM Prison Service (2010). *Population Monthly Bulletin*, February 2010 www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk.
- The Corston Report (2007). *A review of women with particular vulnerabilities in the criminal justice system*, London: The Home Office.
- Ministry of Justice (2008). *Population in custody monthly tables*, September 2008.
- Ministry of Justice (2009i). *Offender management caseload statistics 2008*, London: TSO.
- Ministry of Justice (2009ii). *Population in custody*, England and Wales, June 2009.
- Ministry of Justice (2009iii). *A report on the government's strategy for diverting women away from crime*.
- Ministry of Justice (2009iv). *Prison population projections 2009–15 England and Wales*.

Ministry of Justice Research Series 16/08 (2008). *The problems and needs of newly sentenced prisoners: results from a national survey*.

Ministry of Justice. Unpublished analysis by Justice Statistics Analytical Services.

New Economics Foundation (2008). *Unlocking value: How we all benefit from investing in alternatives to prison for women offenders*.

O'Brien, M., Mortimer, L., Singleton, N. and Meltzer, H. (2001). *Psychiatric morbidity among women prisoners in England and Wales*, London: TSO.

Prison Reform Trust (2009). Bromley briefings prison fact file, November 2009.

Rumgay, J. (2004). *When victims become offenders: In search of coherence in policy and practice*, London: The Fawcett Society.

Social Exclusion Unit (2002) *Reducing reoffending by ex-prisoners*, London: The Social Exclusion Unit.