



**REPORT ON
AN UNANNOUNCED INSPECTION
OF
HM PRISON
HEWELL GRANGE**

23 – 25 JUNE 2003

BY

HM CHIEF INSPECTOR OF PRISONS

Crown copyright 2003
ISBN 1 84473 102 2
Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Chief Inspectorate of Prisons
1st Floor, Ashley House
Monck Street
London
SW1P 2BQ
England

INTRODUCTION

Hewell Grange is a small open prison in the West Midlands which caters for low risk prisoners with short sentences or those reaching the end of their sentences. This unannounced inspection followed up on our full announced inspection in October 2001 and sought to assess progress on the recommendations that we made then. There is clearly still room for improvement, particularly with regard to the fabric of the prison, but overall the prison was judged to be moving forward.

The inspection found a prison largely at ease with itself and providing a safe and relaxed environment for prisoners. Staff prisoner relations were, in general, mutually respectful, although the physical condition of the building left much to be desired. In particular, the dormitory accommodation resembled a tent city as prisoners sought to make up for the lack of privacy screening by erecting makeshift partitions. In addition evening access to toilets was inadequate, reception required refurbishment and the new kitchen about which we were told on our last inspection still awaits completion. Prisoners also had limited access to the grounds, and therefore had less freedom of movement and access to fresh air than is usual in open prisons.

A range of areas had improved since our last visit, including the food, drug services and preparation for release and reintegration, particularly opportunities to work in the community. On the other hand, inspectors identified continuing weaknesses in certain key procedures, for example induction and suicide prevention. Similarly the personal officer scheme remained underdeveloped and healthcare provision needed to expand further. Nonetheless, the prison had made some welcome progress. This needed to be consolidated, especially if it is to make a success of the proposed allocation of increasing numbers of life sentence prisoners, and this new role forged and sustained.

Anne Owers
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

August 2003

CONTENTS

	Paragraph	Page
INTRODUCTION		3
FACT PAGE		7
1 HEALTHY PRISON SUMMARY	1.01-1.34	9
2 PROGRESS SINCE THE LAST REPORT	2.01-2.110	17
3 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	3.01-3.32	41
APPENDICES		
I	Inspection team	
II	Prisoner population	

FACT PAGE

Task of the establishment

Hewell Grange is an open prison for low-risk prisoners serving sentences of less than four years or those reaching the end of long-term sentences. Although neither categorised nor resourced as a resettlement prison, this is the major focus for Hewell Grange. The prison has recently confirmed its readiness to take up to 35 life-sentenced prisoners, although none were in occupation at the time of the inspection.

Brief history

The prison occupies what was once a country house. Many of the buildings are Grade II star listed, as are parts of the grounds, which include a site of special scientific interest. Hewell Grange became a Borstal in 1946 and held young offenders until 1991, when its role changed to hold category D adult male prisoners.

Area organisation

West Midlands.

Number held

173 at the time of the inspection.

Cost per place per annum

£16,231 (2002/3).

Cost per prisoner place

As above.

Certified normal accommodation

175.

Operational capacity

178.

Last full inspection

October 2001.

Last short unannounced inspection

June 1997.

Description of residential units

Most units are dormitories located on all three floors within the main house. A 'hostel' attached to the house has one double and seven single rooms.

CHAPTER ONE

HEALTHY PRISON SUMMARY

Introduction

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

Safety: prisoners are held in safety

Respect: prisoners are treated with respect as individuals

Purposeful activity: prisoners are fully and purposefully occupied

Resettlement: prisoners are prepared for their release and resettlement into the community with the aim of reducing the likelihood of their re-offending

1.02 HMP Hewell Grange had remained fundamentally unchanged in its role and size since the last inspection, although a recent decision had been made that it should take 35 life-sentenced prisoners. Funding had been made available to make some physical alterations appropriate to the needs of these prisoners. These included the provision of extra office space with a consequent slight reduction in the certified normal accommodation. Two additional middle managers had also been recruited. It was anticipated that the life-sentenced prisoners, none of whom had yet arrived, would share the same accommodation as the other prisoners.

1.03 At the time of the last inspection, there had been a proposal to build a new kitchen to serve both Hewell Grange and the nearby women's prison, HMP Brockhill. The project had experienced numerous delays, mainly due to objections to planning permission on the listed site, and was finally underway during this inspection. Part of the contract included the conversion of the existing kitchen to a shower and toilet block. The existing shower and toilet block had been criticised in the 2001 inspection report. The anticipated date for completion of all the work was March 2004.

Safety

1.04 Hewell Grange provided a safe and relaxed environment for prisoners. In view of the open nature of all the living accommodation, it was surprising and praiseworthy that prisoners did not complain about bullying or thefts of personal belongings.

1.05 The reception building was, as described in the last inspection, cramped and unwelcoming. Planned improvements were included in the second stage of the kitchen contract. All prisoners were provided with a two-day induction but were not given written information on the rules and routines of the prison. An excellent information pack containing useful information about all elements of the regime had been prepared but had not been issued to prisoners. The reception orderly had begun to spend time with all new arrivals and to give them verbal information. This very practical and helpful initiative had been encouraged by management.

1.06 The incentives and earned privileges scheme did not impact significantly on the behaviour of prisoners, largely due to the fact that prisoners on the enhanced level of the scheme were allocated poorer dormitory accommodation. Some prisoners who achieved enhanced status chose not to live in the enhanced accommodation and, although managers stated that they would not be forced to do so, those who did not move did not receive the enhanced level of private cash spending capacity and were therefore penalised as a result of their choice. Prisoners' behaviour was influenced by their keenness to avoid being placed on the basic level, which they believed would lead to their transfer out of the establishment.

1.07 There had been very few instances of self-harm at Hewell Grange. In September 2002, concerns had been noted in the observation book about the distressed state of two prisoners. The level of concern indicated that it may have been wise to open a self-harm booklet (F2052SH) but this had not been done and nor were the concerns noted in the prisoners' personal files. Albeit inaccurate, the belief among staff and prisoners that anyone on an open F2052SH would be transferred out

of Hewell Grange potentially led to some reluctance to disclose concerns or take formal measures.

1.08 An anti-bullying policy was in place, although it had seldom been used and required some updating and strengthening to provide proper means of dealing with bullies and supporting victims.

Respect

1.09 Relationships between staff and prisoners were mainly respectful, relaxed and friendly. Prisoners were usually addressed by their first names and sometimes addressed members of staff in the same way. A small minority of staff, mainly the unified grades, were less engaged with prisoners and, while not disrespectful, remained distant from them.

1.10 The condition of the dormitory accommodation was not respectful. Most of the dormitories on the upper level were partitioned to a height of about 1.5 metres, creating small individual living spaces. On the middle floor, occupied by enhanced prisoners, there were no such partitions and prisoners had used lockers, boxes and bed sheets in attempts to create personal space for themselves. These appeared very unattractive and cluttered, and constituted health and safety hazards. We were informed that funding had been agreed to provide partitioning in these dormitories.

1.11 The general fabric of the building was poor but it was kept mainly clean and tidy. There were some notable exceptions, particularly around the kitchen and dining room where floors and walls were dirty.

1.12 Prisoners living on the top floor associated on the ground floor in the main hall. To use the toilet, they either had to climb several flights of stairs to their living accommodation or use the toilets adjacent to the shower block. Neither the toilets nor the showers were in good condition and the toilets were locked off at 7.30pm each evening to prevent vandalism. There had been instances of prisoners urinating into bottles to avoid the long climb upstairs for a toilet. The toilet and shower block were due for re-siting as part of the kitchen contract and managers assured us that it would then not be necessary to lock them off in the evening.

1.13 Formal complaints by prisoners were answered promptly and helpfully, although a few prisoners indicated that they would not complain because they feared it might lead to their transfer out of Hewell Grange. While there was no evidence that this had ever happened and plenty of evidence to the contrary, it remained the perception of a few.

1.14 The food served to prisoners was of good quality and plentiful. Catering staff were always present at the servery and dealt with whatever complaints or questions that prisoners raised.

1.15 On arrival at Hewell Grange, prisoners were immediately credited with £2 on their PIN telephone account to enable them to contact their families that day. Visitors to prisoners were treated well by the staff and on sunny days visits took place on a terraced area overlooking the lawns.

1.16 The health care department was staffed by one nurse who worked weekday mornings. Prisoners frequently knocked on her door without an appointment and she dealt with their requests in a friendly and helpful manner. There was no facility for prisoners to report sick during the afternoons and weekends. Any prisoner suffering an accident or displaying symptoms of concern would be escorted to an outside hospital; lesser ailments went untreated until the nurse or doctor was next on duty.

Purposeful activity

1.17 Although prisoners were not confined to their rooms at any time, there were considerable restrictions on when they could leave the house and where they could go. They were only allowed to associate outside the house at lunchtimes and for an hour and a half in the evenings. At weekends, they were allowed out between 10.15am and noon. Prisoners who were on rest days from their work were also confined to the house. When prisoners did go out, they had to keep to specified areas, which did not include the terrace or the lawns at the back of the house.

1.18 All prisoners were in employment or education. The education department offered a range of courses up to level 3 and provided outreach workers in basic skills

to other workplaces. Teachers offered prisoners help with filling in forms on an informal basis and a part-time focus course covered curriculum vitae writing and interview skills. Evening classes had been introduced but were temporarily suspended during the summer evenings at the request of prisoners. Development of the information technology course was prevented by the obsolete hardware being used.

1.19 Although qualifications could have been gained from some of the work that prisoners were doing, there was little opportunity to do so. This point had been made in the last inspection report and there had been very little progress since then. A quality improvement group had been established and had produced some plans for introducing accreditation into various workplaces but this had yet to happen. In the construction operatives workshop, a conscious decision had been taken to equip prisoners with work skills that could gain them employment, with the aim of placing them on the working-out scheme. Experience had indicated that this was the most successful means of getting prisoners straight into paid employment on discharge.

Resettlement

1.20 There was no effective resettlement strategy, with the result that some of the very good initiatives were not co-ordinated and that, for many people in Hewell Grange, resettlement was perceived as being synonymous with the working-out scheme.

1.21 While there was a personal officer scheme in that named officers were allocated to prisoners, it was acknowledged that, in reality, prisoners approached any member of staff. Personal officers did, however, contribute to parole reports. Prisoners' personal files had very few entries in them; in some cases, there had been no entry since reception some months earlier. This appeared to indicate that staff were not working closely with prisoners or that they were failing to note these dealings.

1.22 Sentence plans were in place and up to date for all prisoners serving over four years. No sentence plans were completed for prisoners serving shorter sentences. This omission had been authorised by the Area Manager for over a year due to

staffing shortages. There did not, however, seem to be an acknowledgement of the impact that this was having on prisoners' progress in identifying and addressing their offending behaviour needs.

1.23 A good range of services was provided, both internally and by external agencies, to meet re-integration needs on discharge. In particular, prisoners trained by NACRO were having some success in finding accommodation for people, either for home detention curfew purposes or on discharge. Prisoners were screened for needs on reception and again after 28 or 56 days. Their needs were not then systematically addressed and the work of the various agencies was not directed to provide maximum benefit to all the prisoners who may have benefited from it. No particular provision was targeted at the substantial number of prisoners who had very little time left to serve when they arrived at Hewell Grange.

1.24 Parole dossiers were being completed on time and there was a very high level of release on home detention curfew and temporary licence, with very few failures.

1.25 At the time of this inspection, 47 prisoners were in full-time paid employment outside the prison and the intention was to increase this number to 60. Arrangements to secure and monitor work were well structured and there was evidence of some prisoners retaining their employment after discharge. Employed prisoners paid a small proportion of their earnings into the Hewell fund, a registered charity, and this was then used to equip other prisoners with the necessary training, clothes and equipment to secure paid employment.

Conclusion

1.26 Hewell Grange offered prisoners a safe and mainly respectful environment. Aspects of the physical environment, including many of the dormitories, were less respectful. Health care provision was good, but insufficient to meet the needs of the population. Prisoners were restricted in their access to the grounds and much of the purposeful activity available to them did not lead to the acquisition of qualifications. Entries in prisoners' personal files did not indicate that personal officers or other uniformed staff were engaging with prisoners in any depth. There was considerable resettlement work but no overarching strategy and the needs of short-stay prisoners

were not being met. Efforts to secure paid employment, both during sentence and on discharge, had met with considerable success.

Main recommendations

- 1.27 All dormitories should be partitioned as soon as possible.**

- 1.28 Funding should be provided to increase the health care provision so that a nurse is on duty throughout the working week.**

- 1.29 Prisoners' access to the grounds should be reviewed and consideration should be given to extending the boundaries and the times, and to the potential benefits of linking the entitlement to the incentives and earned privileges scheme.**

- 1.30 All work activities should be assessed for opportunities to gain qualifications and these should be established wherever possible.**

- 1.31 A comprehensive resettlement strategy should be constructed and published to all staff and prisoners.**

- 1.32 Sentence plans should be completed for all eligible prisoners.**

- 1.33 The personal officer scheme should be reviewed to ensure that regular contact takes place with individual prisoners and that this is recorded.**

- 1.34 A needs assessment should be carried out for all prisoners who stay less than a month at Hewell Grange before discharge and a strategy should be put in place to meet those needs.**

CHAPTER TWO

PROGRESS SINCE THE LAST REPORT

Introduction

2.01 We have used the recommendations from our inspection of October 2001 as a framework to examine progress achieved. We have commented where we have found significant improvements, and where we believe little or no progress had been made and work remained to be done.

2.02 During this inspection, we concentrated on aspects that directly affect the treatment and conditions for prisoners and so did not examine all the recommendations from the last inspection. The paragraph reference numbers at the end of each recommendation below refer to its location in the previous inspection report.

Recommendations

To the Director General

2.03 *The CNA should be reviewed to reduce overcrowding in the dormitories. (2.03)*

Partially achieved. Some minor reduction in the certified normal accommodation had taken place, although this had included some re-designation of rooms to accommodate life-sentenced prisoners in the near future. The dormitories remained overcrowded but would be tolerable when refurbished.

2.04 *The Prison Service's Drug Strategy Unit should review the use of random drug testing at Hewell Grange to assess its benefits. (7.29)*

Achieved. The use of random testing had been reviewed. The Director General concluded that mandatory drug tests were necessary both to act as a deterrent to the misuse of drugs and to provide specific information on the levels of such misuse.

2.05 *In light of the problems that have arisen in developing similar 'cluster' arrangements elsewhere in the prison estate, the scheme for a cluster kitchen serving Hewell Grange and Brockhill should be abandoned in favour of refurbishing the two existing kitchens. (8.09)*

Not achieved. The proposed cluster kitchen was under construction and was expected to be completed by the end of the year.

2.06 *The cost benefits of the contracting out of prison shops should be reviewed at national level. (8.11)*

Achieved. The Prison Service Director of Finance had commissioned an independent review of the contracts in 2001 and had concluded that they represented value for money. It remained the case that the cost of items in the shop at Hewell Grange, and at many other prisons, was significantly higher than in 'high street' retail outlets.

To the Area Manager

2.07 *Additional resources should be made available to implement appropriate options arising from the findings of the throughcare policy group. (ES21)*

Achieved. A bid for £200,000 had been submitted to pay for resettlement projects; £89,000 had been allocated, which had been used to buy a van and to employ additional staff to manage and support the working-out project.

2.08 *More prisoners should be enabled to work in the local community rather than in the prison. (6.06)*

Achieved. Forty-seven prisoners (26% of the population) were employed in full-time paid jobs outside the prison at the time of the inspection. The target for the month following this inspection was 60 prisoners (34% of the population). Working-out was not a realistic target for all prisoners due to their sentence length or the time they had left to serve on arrival at Hewell Grange.

To the Governor

Main recommendations

2.09 *Reception procedures for prisoners arriving at Hewell Grange should be reviewed to make it a more welcoming experience. (ES18)*

Recommendation not assessed. As no prisoners were transferred into the establishment during the inspection, we were unable to observe the reception procedures. However, we were present in the reception area when a small number of prisoners returned either from work or from appointments in the community. In each case, the officers concerned dealt with the prisoners appropriately and respectfully.

2.10 *The induction programme should be tailored to the length of time new prisoners are expected to be at the prison. (ES18)*

Not achieved. The establishment planned to incorporate such information into a new induction programme. However, no distinction had been made in the existing programme to cater for the different needs of short- and long-term prisoners. **We repeat the recommendation.**

2.11 *The cleanliness of all living areas should be maintained to a high standard. (ES19)*

Not achieved. The personal space in the dormitories was generally clean and tidy, as were many, but not all, of the communal areas. Prisoners were given cleaning jobs but not all of this work was adequately supervised or checked. The action plan stated that a house management committee would monitor standards but we were unable to find any evidence of this committee's work. **We repeat the recommendation.**

2.12 *An effective personal officer scheme should be implemented and staff should take on the role of case officers. (ES19)*

Not achieved. Personal officers were allocated as part of the resettlement induction interview and each prisoner was given his personal officer's name in writing. Each residential officer was responsible for 10 or 11 prisoners, although there was little evidence that they proactively provided systematic ongoing support. A number of officers and managers reported that they did not think any work could be expected of them if the prisoner was staying in the prison for only a short time. Personal officers did contribute to parole reports and some examples of ongoing support were found for those prisoners who were staying in the prison for a long time, although these were the exception rather than the rule.

2.13 A sample of 38 prisoners' history sheets revealed that:

- They had a average of one comment each
- 19 had no comment (some of these prisoners having been at Hewell Grange over nine months)
- Eight had one comment
- 10 had between three and five comments
- Only four prisoners had a positive comment other than recording regime enhancement

2.14 This supported the evidence from staff that personal officer work was either not being undertaken or was not recorded when it was. This disadvantaged risk assessment, personal support and release planning.

2.15 The prison action plan had recorded that the small number of staff and shift patterns made personal officer work difficult. While the shift work of staff and prisoners was a factor, personal officers could have a back-up officer to improve continuity. Equally, prisoners and staff were free to associate until late in the evening, when significant interaction could have taken place. At the same time, the full employment of prisoners during the day should have allowed time for wing staff to make meaningful written records of prisoners' progress.

2.16 *A training strategy should be drawn up to ensure that all prisoners gain some form of accreditation for the skills and knowledge they have gained through their work at the prison. (ES20)*

See paragraph 2.87.

2.17 *The drug strategy team should undertake a needs assessment of the prisoner population. (ES21)*

Achieved. A need assessment had been undertaken in April 2002.

2.18 *The Prison Service Drug Strategy Unit should review the use of random drug testing at Hewell Grange to assess its benefits. (ES21)*

See paragraph 2.04.

2.19 *The throughcare committee should advise the Governor of strategies to improve resettlement provision. (ES21)*

Partially achieved. A regimes and resettlement committee met monthly, although no terms of reference were available. The three meetings prior to the inspection, which had been attended by between five and 10 people and were chaired by the deputy Governor, included reports from departments within the resettlement department. The committee had reviewed the provision of resettlement services where these related to working-out, release on temporary licence, home detention curfew and sentence planning. However re-integration services for those requiring assistance with housing, employment or other post-release support were not included on the agenda. There was evidence that the committee had progressed a number of resettlement issues, most noticeably the working-out scheme.

2.20 The work of the regimes and resettlement committee appeared to be somewhat disadvantaged by the merging of these two significant functions into one meeting and by the lack of clarity of the terms ‘resettlement’ and ‘throughcare’, neither of which seemed to include re-integration issues. There was no specific re-integration agenda or policy, although this was being progressed under the separate management of the head of residence.

2.21 *Throughcare and preparation for release should be meaningful, relevant and achievable. (ES21)*

Partially achieved. The throughcare department was responsible for managing and completing sentence plans for all prisoners. At the time of the last inspection, no plans were being completed on those serving less than four years because only two staff had been trained to do this work, one of whom was on long-term sick leave. Two years later, the prison was still not completing these plans under the authority of a temporary non-compliance certificate from the Area Manager. At the time of this inspection, 70 prisoners were entitled to sentence planning for the rest of their time in custody and to prepare for licence supervision on release but were not being offered this facility. The fact that no system was in place to monitor the number of prisoners affected or to provide an alternative provision was of particular concern. The throughcare manager had given no consideration to the impact on prisoners of failing to provide this key service.

2.22 There were also 24 prisoners who were not eligible for sentence planning because they were serving less than 12 months. No short form of assessment or intervention was in place for these prisoners, who had made up approximately 15% of the population for a considerable time.

2.23 Considerable progress had been made in providing preparation for release and re-integration services. A short preparation for work course provided by the education department was available to those preparing for working-out or release. In the two months prior to the inspection, 40% of released prisoners had permanent jobs to start immediately. The prison had maintained its high level of release on home detention curfew and was setting up a housing project to assist those who would be eligible for this if they did not have accommodation problems.

Further recommendation

2.24 Consideration should be given to devising a local custody planning system to meet the needs of prisoners with sentences of less than 12 months.

2.25 *Staff in singleton posts currently working in throughcare services should be supported by additional staff to ensure better continuity of provision. (ES21)*

Not achieved. There continued to be singleton posts in the throughcare department and the absence of a trained sentence planning officer had had a significant impact on the sentence planning provision. Due to the small size of the establishment, other staff such as the programme manager were in singleton and multi-faceted posts. There were plans for all throughcare staff to be trained for the introduction of the new Oasys sentence planning system.

Local practice recommendations

2.26 *In addition to the information given verbally during the reception process, written and visual information about Hewell Grange should be made available for prisoners to consider during reception and their first night. (1.05)*

Not achieved. The action plan stated that improved information had been provided by the end of July 2002. In practice, however, very little written information was provided to prisoners in the reception area. Some of the examples of literature given

to us were so poorly reproduced as to make some sections illegible. Video presentations were not used, although these were planned for the near future. A regime information booklet containing useful and necessary information had been produced but was not generally made available to prisoners. **We repeat the recommendation.**

Additional information

2.27 The reception orderly delivered verbal information to new prisoners. He had decided on the content of his talk himself, incorporating information that he was regularly asked about and which he thought necessary. He also accompanied prisoners on a short tour of the establishment. This was a good example of peer support, although it was not monitored or supervised by staff.

Further recommendation

2.28 **The peer support offered by the reception orderly should be formalised, evaluated and monitored by the establishment to ensure that the orderly is adequately supported and that the information is appropriate and sufficient.**

2.29 *The reception areas used to hold newly arrived prisoners should be made more welcoming. (1.07)*

Not achieved. We were aware of plans to remodel the reception area, although there had been little improvement since the last inspection. The area remained cramped, inadequate and shabby, and prisoners continued to be strip-searched here in view of anyone in the corridor alongside the dining hall. **We repeat the recommendation.**

2.30 *Prisoners and their belongings should be supervised effectively during their time in reception. (1.08)*

Achieved. New prisoners' belongings were no longer left in the unlocked television room but were locked in a secure room in the reception area.

2.31 *More time and greater effort should be taken at the reception stage to identify and respond to any immediate problems or needs, rather than relying on these being picked up once the prisoner has moved into dormitory accommodation. (1.09)*

Achieved. While in reception, each prisoner completed a form containing several questions about his safety, including any thoughts of suicide and self-harm and any urgent family/personal/health care problems. The reception officer was required to speak in depth to prisoners who responded positively to any of these questions. The officer noted the details of any identified issues on the form and the initial action taken by him/her. The deputy Governor or duty manager was informed about any prisoners who expressed major problems or concerns.

2.32 *'Induction' packs should be made available on the day of reception, and if possible issued at reception. (1.10)*

Achieved. On arrival, all prisoners were issued with an induction pack while in the reception area.

Additional information

2.33 The reception packs were not stored in the reception area and had to be collected by an operational support grade from the prison shop. Difficulties could arise when prisoners were received outside normal hours or when there were delays in obtaining the necessary keys/personnel.

2.34 *All prisoners should have the opportunity to make a telephone call to their family or friends on the day of arrival. (1.10)*

Achieved. Each prisoner received telephone credits to the value of £2 on arrival and the necessary telephone system was activated the same day.

Induction

2.35 *The induction programme should be reviewed regularly to ensure that it addresses the identified needs of the prison population and that it is meeting its stated objectives. (1.14)*

Not achieved. Although we understood that the induction programme was under review at the time of this inspection, the current programme did not adequately address the different needs and interests of short- and long-term prisoners. **We repeat the recommendation.**

2.36 *Issues covered in induction, especially those that relate to the rights and responsibilities of the prisoner and the prison, should be available in writing and easily accessible to all prisoners. (1.15)*

Not achieved. The published information book was not generally made available and there was a heavy reliance on the spoken word. For example, a 30-minute slot was allocated for a ‘talk by the induction officer’, which required the delivery of 21 different topics of information. It was not possible to deliver quality information within this timescale. **We repeat the recommendation.**

Residential units

2.37 *There should be clear cleaning schedules for all prisoners’ personal space, and effective supervision and inspection of cleanliness. (2.02)*

Partially achieved. The dormitory areas were generally clean and tidy, although there were no cleaning schedules specifically for prisoners’ personal space. Officers inspected the cleanliness of the dormitories every weekend.

Additional information

2.38 Most prisoners continued to be accommodated in dormitories, as identified at the last inspection. Prisoners on the standard level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme occupied 16 dormitories on the top floor; those on the enhanced level occupied 10 dormitories on the middle floor.

2.39 With one exception, the dormitories on the top floor contained partitioned areas designed to separate the living space of the prisoners in each room. The partitioning was approximately 1.5 metres high. Although the units did not have doors and offered little privacy, the partitions did provide clear, if cramped, individual personal space. Each area contained a bed, a locker, a small wardrobe and sometimes a chair. Many of the lockers could not be locked securely.

2.40 Some of the dormitories occupied by enhanced prisoners on the middle floor also contained partitions. However, those in dormitories without such partitioning had created their own personal space using furniture and items such as boxes and draped blankets or sheets. While this had the desired effect of providing some individual privacy, it also created the appearance of a temporary ‘tented’ area. It was

disrespectful that prisoners had not been provided with more suitable screening, although we were aware that prison managers were planning to improve the situation in the near future. The current situation also presented a possible fire risk and could hinder safe movement from the dormitory in an emergency.

2.41 The dormitories were not provided with curtains and, in many cases, prisoners had tacked bedding over the windows. Again, this lack of curtains was disrespectful in that it failed to set or encourage a minimum standard that most people aspire to in their own accommodation.

Further recommendations

2.42 **All prisoners should be provided with lockable lockers where they can safely keep personal possessions.**

2.43 **Curtains should be provided in all dormitories.**

2.44 *All dormitories on the standard level should be provided with electricity for small appliances. (2.04)*

Achieved. All dormitories had been provided with electricity.

2.45 *The showers on the ground floor should be refurbished. (2.11)*

Not achieved. A new shower block was programmed to be built during 2003/4.

Ventilation continued to be very poor in the existing ground floor showers: condensation dripped from the walls and ceiling and the strong smell of damp noted during the last inspection was unavoidable. Water was pooled on the floor and the area was not well cleaned. There was litter within the shower units and both in and around the floor grid. **We repeat the recommendation.**

2.46 *Cleaning schedules should be introduced. (2.12)*

Partially achieved. The last inspection found that cleaners did not have itemised cleaning schedules and therefore had no clear direction or qualitative guide for their work. Cleaning schedules had been produced in December 2002, although not all officers were aware of this and none of the cleaners to whom we spoke had been given one.

2.47 *Consideration should be given to making the house manager responsible for all cleaning within Hewell Grange. (2.13)*

Rejected by the prison. This had been rejected on the grounds that the house manager was a civilian instructor who was already responsible for the main public areas in addition to his instructing duties.

Additional information

2.48 As during the last inspection, some areas of the establishment were cleaned to a higher standard than others. A number of personnel continued to have responsibility for various areas within the establishment.

Further recommendation

2.49 **High standards of cleanliness should apply equally throughout the establishment. Specific cleaning schedules should be developed for the dormitories and managers should ensure that all staff and cleaners are made aware of these.**

Recreational facilities, time out-of-cell, association and exercise

2.50 *More reasonable access to toilet facilities should be provided 24 hours per day. (2.14)*

Not achieved. Security concerns meant that restrictions on access to ground floor toilet facilities remained in place after 7.30pm each evening. After this time, the only facilities available to standard level prisoners were on the top floor.

2.51 *Prisoners should be allowed recreational time in the fresh air every day. (2.16)*

Not achieved. This recommendation related specifically to the absence of access to open air exercise during the winter for those prisoners employed inside the building. Appropriate arrangements were not in place during last winter, although outside exercise during the lunchtime periods had been introduced recently. We were told that these arrangements would now continue.

Additional information

2.52 On completion of the new cluster kitchen, plans were in place for the conversion of the existing kitchen to provide toilets and showers on the ground floor. The projected completion date for this work was March 2004, from which date prisoners would have 24-hour access to toilets on the ground floor.

Personal officer scheme

2.53 *Management should determine a strategy to revitalise the personal officer scheme. (2.19)*

See paragraph 2.12.

Self-harm and suicide

2.54 *Efforts should continue to ensure effective screening and observation of prisoners within their first 48 hours at Hewell Grange. (3.03)*

Not achieved. Many effective systems were in place for screening new receptions and monitoring them over the first 48 hours. However, health care staff were available only in the mornings from Monday to Friday, with the result that new receptions were routinely seen the following morning; those new receptions received on a Friday were not seen until the following Monday. The inadequacy of the health care cover had been recognised by management. Plans were in place to increase the hours of health care cover to include Friday afternoons until 4pm specifically to process prisoners received that day. We remained concerned, however, that any new receptions arriving after 4pm would not receive effective screening.

2.55 *Information concerning prisoners identified as 'at risk' should be properly recorded, even when F2052SH forms are not considered appropriate. (3.03)*

Not achieved. We found examples where concerns raised in observation books had not been properly recorded in the relevant wing files and, where initial concerns had been recorded, there were no entries giving details of follow-up action. **We repeat the recommendation.**

Additional information

2.56 The establishment had a relatively low level of open F2052SH (self-harm) booklets, with only one so far this year and a total of five in 2002. Where a document

had been raised in the past, on almost every occasion it had resulted in the prisoner being transferred. This raised the concern that prisoners may be reluctant to confide in staff for fear of being moved. Equally, we found some instances where the level of concern noted in observation books should have resulted in a F2052SH being opened but this had not been done. One prisoner, for example, was described as having difficulty coping and being clearly depressed; another was reported as having burst into tears after entering the office and it was again recorded that he was not coping. On neither occasion was a F2052SH booklet opened. The establishment had trained listeners who made a valuable contribution to the induction programme. We found that the designated room provided for their use was being used as a cleaning cupboard.

Further recommendation

2.57 Local management should develop a strategy that outlines effective arrangements for managing prisoners on open F2052SH booklets.

Anti-bullying

2.58 Responsibility for anti-bullying should be devolved to other staff, following the model used for suicide prevention. (3.05)

Achieved. The responsibility for anti-bullying had been devolved to the principal officer for residence.

2.59 The anti-bullying policy should include specific interventions to be offered to identified bullies and for victims. (3.06)

Not achieved. The anti-bullying policy was still in need of some minor improvements and the significant addition of programmes to intervene in the behaviour of bullies and victims subject to the strategy. The strategy had been used once in the months prior to the inspection, although the inexperience of staff and managers had meant that its use on this occasion had been inappropriate and therefore ineffective. There were examples of reports of bullying in case records with no evidence of referral to the anti-bullying policy.

Further recommendation

2.60 The anti-bullying policy should be enhanced by including interventions for bullies and victims, and should be promoted to managers, staff and prisoners.

Race relations, suicide prevention and anti-bullying

2.61 *Managers should ensure that all staff attend required training. (3.10)*

Not achieved. Training on race relations, suicide prevention and anti-bullying had not been provided for any staff in the 12 months prior to this inspection. In 2002, 13 staff had attended race relations training, eight had been trained in suicide awareness training and none in anti-bullying. **We repeat the recommendation.**

Requests and complaints

2.62 *All request and complaint replies should clearly state the name of the signatory. (3.12)*

Not achieved. The establishment had a relatively low level of complaints, all of which had been dealt with within prescribed timescales since 1 April 2003. Replies were generally helpful and respectful, although there were still examples where the name of the signatory was not clearly stated. **We repeat the recommendation.**

Additional information

2.63 During the course of the inspection, we received some informal indication from prisoners that they were reluctant to complain because they feared that this might result in transfer. While this could not be evidenced, it was inferred by prisoners in various locations and on different occasions.

Incentives and earned privileges

2.64 *Management should ensure that the rules concerning application for enhanced status after 28 days at Hewell Grange are applied consistently. (4.04)*

Achieved. The incentives and earned privileges scheme had recently been reviewed and all new receptions were required to complete 28 days at Hewell Grange before applying for enhanced status. These applications were considered by a weekly board and the 28-day rule was applied consistently.

2.65 *Procedures should be put in place to identify those with reading difficulties and to explain the compact and other essential information verbally. (4.05)*

Not achieved. This recommendation was made in response to a statement in the incentives and earned privileges compact that explained, somewhat unhelpfully, that prisoners with reading difficulties could have the compact read to them by an officer. Despite a review of the incentives and earned privileges policy document, this statement remained in the compact. **We repeat the recommendation.**

Additional information

2.66 Arrangements for prisoners on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme were included in the local policy document, although any prisoner demoted to that level was usually transferred. With the exception of prisoners being eager to avoid the basic level and possibility of transfer, the scheme had little impact on prisoners' behaviour. Prisoners on the enhanced level were normally located on the middle floor, although some were mixed with standard-level prisoners on the top floor. Those electing to remain on the top floor were allowed to do so but did not receive the higher level of private cash allowance.

Security

2.67 *Management should consider relaxing restriction of movement to the outside of the prison to bring it into line with common expectations of an open prison. (4.08)*

Recommendation rejected by the Prison Service. Prisoners at Hewell Grange continue to have less freedom of movement and less access to fresh air than is usual in an open prison. Prisoners on a rest day from work were confined to the house, as were all prisoners on weekend afternoons.

Health care

2.68 *Smoking cessation, asthma and diabetes clinics should be provided (5.07)*

Not achieved. Within the limits of staff availability, as much support as possible was given to prisoners wishing to stop smoking. Links between health care and the catering and physical education departments supported prisoners who wished to improve their general health and lifestyle but it was not possible to provide clinics within the 20 hours a week that the nurse was on duty.

Pharmacy

2.69 *A daily record of the maximum and minimum temperatures of the refrigerator should be maintained. (5.13)*

Achieved. Records showed that a system had been in place, and adhered to, since 22 October 2001.

2.70 *An alternative room with hand-washing facilities should be used for urine testing. (5.14)*

Partially achieved. Although it had not been possible to provide an alternative room, a designated cupboard for urine testing equipment had been sited in the medical room.

2.71 *Patient-specific and stock items should always be separated, and patient-specific items should not be used as stock. (5.15)*

Achieved. Separate shelves had been labelled for patient-specific medication and all such medication was labelled with the patient's name.

2.72 *A regular system of checking should be adopted in order to remove unwanted or date-expired stock. (5.16)*

Achieved. Records were kept to show regular returns of both date-expired and unwanted stock.

2.73 *A clear written policy for out-of-hours access to the health centre should be formulated, incorporating an audit trail and instructions on use of an out-of-hours record book. (5.17)*

Not achieved. Plans for access to medication for pain relief, sickness and diarrhoea were ready for implementation but not in use. **We repeat the recommendation.**

2.74 *Pre-packs should be dual labelled. When an item is prescribed, one of the labels should be removed from the pre-pack and securely attached to the prescription form. (5.20)*

Achieved. All packs were dual labelled and prescription forms were annotated when items were prescribed.

2.75 *A prescribing formulary and a stock list should be created in consultation with the pharmacist at HMP Birmingham. (5.21)*

Achieved. The pharmacist at HMP Featherstone, who had taken over responsibility from HMP Birmingham, had prepared a West Midlands Area Formulary.

2.76 *Prescription-only medicines should be removed from the list of items that can be supplied as special sick. (5.22)*

Achieved. A new list prepared on 19 May 2003 did not contain any prescription medication.

2.77 *The pharmacist should visit HMP Hewell Grange on a monthly basis to oversee, advise on and promote the pharmaceutical service. (5.25)*

Partially achieved. The pharmacist from HMP Featherstone had visited twice in the first five months of the year and a further visit was planned. The nurse stated that she received very good telephone support from the pharmacist.

2.78 *A drugs and therapeutics committee should be set up and the pharmacist at HMP Birmingham should be a member of it. (5.26)*

Not achieved.

Further recommendation

2.79 A drugs and therapeutics committee should be set up and the pharmacist at HMP Featherstone should be a member of it.

2.80 *Patient information leaflets should be made available to all prisoners. (5.28)*

Partially achieved. Patient information leaflets were readily available but were seldom issued to, or requested by, patients.

Education

2.81 *The vacant teaching post should be filled as soon as possible. (6.08)*

Achieved. The education department was fully staffed.

2.82 *Consideration should be given to the reinstatement of evening classes. (6.10)*

Achieved. Evening classes had been reinstated approximately 12 months previously. These ran each Tuesday and offered basic skills, art and computer courses. At the time of this inspection, evening classes had been suspended for the summer period because they clashed with open-air association, which many prisoners preferred to do. This decision had been taken following full consultation with prisoners and planning was already underway to reintroduce evening classes at the beginning of September.

2.83 *Tutorials should be modified to ensure that each session sets clear targets for student achievement. (6.12)*

Achieved. Tutorials took place between tutors and students every three to four weeks, when relevant targets were discussed and agreed. Where appropriate, targets were then fed into individual sentence plans.

2.84 *The education department should consider offering courses at level 3 standard to meet the needs of some prisoners. (6.14)*

Achieved. Level 3 courses had been introduced in literacy, numeracy and the CLAIT computer course. Individual support had also been provided to those prisoners who had commenced courses elsewhere, such as the Higher National Diploma in computing and Open University.

2.85 *Information technology equipment should be updated to ensure that students are able to use hardware and software similar to that used outside the prison. (6.15)*

Not achieved. Successive bids for funding to upgrade the information technology equipment in the education department had been unsuccessful. This had left the department with a serious lack of resources and was preventing individual development. Prisoners were required to work with out-of-date equipment and packages that had no relevance to the workplace. **We repeat the recommendation.**

2.86 *Attention should be given to linking education with training and physical education. (6.16)*

Achieved. A provision of three hours per week for basic skills outreach had been established. Prisoners who were identified through induction assessment as having literacy or numeracy needs were seen in their workplace and encouraged to address their problems. Advice and support were available in course selection and in basics

such as letter writing and completing forms. Several departments, including education and physical education, had linked to provide lifestyle support, and a life skills course was due to be introduced from September with various departments involved in its presentation.

Training

2.87 *A training strategy should be developed to ensure that all workers gain access to some form of accreditation for the skills and knowledge they have gained at the prison. The strategy should include targets for the achievement of qualifications by trainees, monitoring and quality improvement procedures, sharing of good practice, and links to the education department. (6.22)*

Partially achieved. A quality improvement group had been established and, as part of the process, activity areas had completed self-assessments and prepared action plans for improvement. Despite this, there had been no significant increase in the level of accreditation available to prisoners, although plans to introduce national vocational qualifications into the kitchen and proficiency qualifications into farms and gardens were at an advanced stage. The construction operatives course continued to develop well and was appropriately focusing on employability skills.

Library

2.88 *The library and education department should jointly organise library awareness sessions for prisoners to promote still greater and more effective use of the library facilities.*

Partially achieved. New receptions were shown the location of the library as part of the induction programme but were not given the opportunity to go inside to find out what the facility had to offer. Prisoners attending any form of education course were routinely taken to the library where the sections relevant to their needs were pointed out.

Physical education

2.89 *The use of other staff as sports and games officers should be considered. (6.27)*

Achieved. The use of sports and games officers had been considered but had been rejected because the increase in access to sport was not identified as sufficient priority to allocate uniformed staff to this task.

Throughcare

2.90 *The throughcare committee should be reviewed to ensure that policy is developed and that the Governor is provided with options. (7.02)*

See paragraph 2.19.

2.91 *Prison officers should deal with all general queries and should refer on cases for which special arrangements are already in place, such as housing. Prisoners should also be given additional guidance at induction about who to consult on these subjects. (7.06)*

Partially achieved. Prisoners had free access to prison officers in the wing office and could make written or verbal applications for assistance from them. Wing officers dealt with prisoners' day-to-day problems and referred appropriately to others with a specialist responsibility when necessary. A substantial prisoners' induction book had been produced but was not available to staff or prisoners. Although a copy was kept in the library, no one knew about it.

2.92 *If programmes co-ordination is acknowledged as valuable, it should be properly funded on a permanent basis. (7.07)*

Achieved. The post of the programmes manager had been made full-time using funds found from within the establishment. However, the programmes manager undertook many more roles than just managing programmes full time. She also delivered the level 3 short interventions (victim awareness, personal development and alcohol awareness), offered one-to-one counselling services and provided risk assessment reports for home detention curfew and other assessment processes.

2.93 *All documents that comprise the papers on which the HDC board makes its decision should be accurately and fully completed. In reaching its decision, the board should take due account of prisoners who still require intervention courses to reduce the risk of re-offending on release. (7.10)*

Achieved. The management and monitoring of home detention curfew files was appropriate and decisions were made based on completed assessments. There were examples of decisions being appropriately adjourned to allow for risk assessments to be completed. Any issues relating to continuing interventions on release were taken into consideration.

2.94 *Consideration should be given to adopting an alternative approach so that prisoners are allocated personal officers including instructors, PE or SPU staff who can be relied upon to perform this role. (7.12)*

See paragraph 2.12.

2.95 *The throughcare committee should consider different options for prisoners staying long and short term at Hewell Grange. (7.18)*

Not achieved. Hewell Grange had a significant number of prisoners who were serving short sentences or had only a short time of their sentence left to serve on arrival at the prison. All prisoners were seen on induction by a throughcare officer who conducted a brief assessment and settled issues related to release date and accommodation needs. This was not sufficient to assess and meet the immediate needs of people facing imminent release. The system did allow prisoners with identified problems to be referred to the prisoner-managed NACRO project and the other employment or benefits services. However, there was no systematic modular scheme to ensure that all prisoners were assessed by specialists.

2.96 Resettlement and re-integration information was only sporadically available on notice boards. Although there were a lot of notice boards in the residential areas, many of the notices displayed were obsolete or incorrect. We found, for example, two different incentives and earned privileges scheme protocols on display on the same corridor.

2.97 *The throughcare committee should work together to provide services that are meaningful and relevant to preparing and supporting prisoners for normal life in the community. (7.18)*

Achieved. A wide range of services provided by prison staff, external agencies and prisoners was available, including: Citizens Advice Bureau surgeries for prisoners and

their families; a prisoner-led NACRO housing support service; access to job centre information; income support advice; an interview service; and a number of mentoring schemes for prisoners for certain West Midlands locations. A number of other projects were also being developed to support prisoners post-release. However, the absence of a custody plan for all prisoners meant that there was no way of ensuring that all prisoners had access to these services. The prison had unsuccessfully applied for funds to set up a specific support project to prepare prisoners for release both while working-out and post-discharge.

2.98 *Prison officers should be encouraged to engage in working with prisoners and to support key departments at Hewell Grange. (7.18)*

See paragraph 2.12.

2.99 *Additional resources should be made available to implement appropriate options arising from the findings of the throughcare policy group. (7.18)*

See paragraph 2.07.

2.100 *The issue of 'police days' should be covered routinely during induction so that applications can be submitted within days of prisoners' arrival at Hewell Grange. (7.24)*

Not achieved. There was an induction interview process that could incorporate a check that police days had been reconciled, although this had not been included in the proforma. **We repeat the recommendation.**

Substance use strategy

2.101 *Consideration should be given as to whether a drug strategy co-ordinator should be appointed at a less senior level to oversee the day-to-day implementation and co-ordination of the drug strategy. (7.25)*

Achieved. This had been considered but staffing levels had meant that responsibility remained with the deputy Governor.

2.102 *The drug strategy team should make it a priority to undertake a needs assessment and to develop ongoing information systems to inform the delivery and development of services. (7.26)*

Partially achieved. A needs assessment had been undertaken in April 2002. However, there was no evidence of the development of ongoing information systems to inform the delivery and development of drug services. **We repeat the recommendation.**

2.103 *The CARAT team's resettlement work should be carefully assessed to determine whether this support post-discharge increases the possibility of a positive outcome for prisoners. (7.27)*

Not achieved. The action plan stated that resources for this were not available. The counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) team continued to offer practical help with resettlement issues related to employment, education and accommodation. **We repeat the recommendation.**

2.104 *The drug strategy team should ensure that resources are found to deliver a health promotion programme to all those at risk of harm from their drug use and associated illnesses. (7.28)*

Achieved. All prisoners were seen individually by a member of health care who offered confidential information and advice. The CARAT team gave general information about communicable diseases to all newly arrived prisoners during the induction programme. They also saw all prisoners identified as having a drug-related offence individually and were able to offer specific advice and information when required. Information leaflets about various communicable diseases and men's health matters generally were freely available from a rack within the prison. Notices were displayed inviting prisoners to contact a member of health care if they had concerns or questions about such diseases. Health promotion was also being progressed through the health improvement plan in liaison with the local health authority.

2.105 *The Governor should liaise with the Area Drug Co-ordinator to adopt a more imaginative and appropriate range of sanctions for those failing MDT. (7.30)*

Achieved. Decisions concerning outcomes for prisoners who failed drug tests were taken on an individual basis. The substance used and the individual circumstances were considered in each case. A range of sanctions was available, ranging from simple warnings, loss of earned privileges, loss of employment within the

establishment and, ultimately, to the possibility of re-categorisation and transfer to another establishment. Every positive result was notified to the CARAT team.

2.106 *Consideration should be given to Hewell Grange becoming a voluntary testing unit. (7.31)*

Achieved. This had been considered by the prison. However, it did not believe that Hewell Grange should become a voluntary testing unit because it felt that this failed to recognise the wider need to manage the increasing prison population.

Catering

2.107 *Consideration should be given to producing printed menus that clearly indicate, through the use of symbols, the different options and diets available. (8.02)*

Achieved. Menus had been redesigned and symbols were used to identify the various options clearly.

2.108 *Sneeze screens were missing from the hotplate in the servery area and should be replaced. (8.03)*

Achieved. Sneeze screens had been fitted to both sides of the hotplate.

2.109 *The food complaints book should be replaced and kept in an area in which its use can be monitored. (8.05)*

Not achieved. This recommendation was rejected by the prison as the food complaints book had previously been withdrawn following abusive comments. The Governor pointed out that catering staff were readily available to discuss issues as they arose with individual prisoners. We received few complaints about food, which appeared to be of a good standard and plentiful with a reasonable range of choice.

Health and safety

2.110 *The workload of the head of management services should be reviewed and some of her commitments redistributed. (8.13)*

Achieved. An additional executive officer had been recruited to take some of the load off the head of management services. A head of finance had also been recruited and was due to take up post in the near future.

CHAPTER THREE

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

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

To the Area Manager

Main recommendations

3.01 Funding should be provided to increase the health care provision so that a nurse is on duty throughout the working week. (1.28)

To the Governor

Main recommendations

3.02 All dormitories should be partitioned as soon as possible. (1.27)

3.03 Prisoners' access to the grounds should be reviewed and consideration should be given to extending the boundaries and the times, and to the potential benefits of linking the entitlement to the incentives and earned privileges scheme. (1.29)

3.04 All work activities should be assessed for opportunities to gain qualifications and these should be established wherever possible. (1.30)

3.05 A comprehensive resettlement strategy should be constructed and published to all staff and prisoners. (1.31)

3.06 Sentence plans should be completed for all eligible prisoners. (1.32)

3.07 The personal officer scheme should be reviewed to ensure that regular contact takes place with individual prisoners and that this is recorded. (1.33)

3.08 A needs assessment should be carried out for all prisoners who stay less than a month at Hewell Grange before discharge and a strategy should be put in place to meet those needs. (1.34)

3.09 The induction programme should be tailored to the length of time new prisoners are expected to be at the prison. (2.10)

3.10 The cleanliness of all living areas should be maintained to a high standard. (2.11)

3.11 Consideration should be given to devising a local custody planning system to meet the needs of prisoners with sentences of less than 12 months. (2.24)

Local practice recommendations

3.12 In addition to the information given verbally during the reception process, written and visual information about Hewell Grange should be made available for prisoners to consider during reception and their first night. (2.26)

3.13 The peer support offered by the reception orderly should be formalised, evaluated and monitored by the establishment to ensure that the orderly is adequately supported and that the information is appropriate and sufficient. (2.28)

3.14 The reception areas used to hold newly arrived prisoners should be made more welcoming. (2.29)

Induction

3.15 The induction programme should be reviewed regularly to ensure that it addresses the identified needs of the prison population and that it is meeting its stated objectives. (2.35)

3.16 Issues covered in induction, especially those that relate to the rights and responsibilities of the prisoner and the prison, should be available in writing and easily accessible to all prisoners. (2.36)

Residential units

3.17 All prisoners should be provided with lockable lockers where they can safely keep personal possessions. (2.42)

3.18 Curtains should be provided in all dormitories. (2.43)

3.19 The showers on the ground floor should be refurbished. (2.45)

3.20 High standards of cleanliness should apply equally throughout the establishment. Specific cleaning schedules should be developed for the dormitories and managers should ensure that all staff and cleaners are made aware of these. (2.49)

Self-harm and suicide

3.21 Information concerning prisoners identified as 'at risk' should be properly recorded, even when F2052SH forms are not considered appropriate. (2.55)

3.22 Local management should develop a strategy that outlines effective arrangements for managing prisoners on open F2052SH booklets. (2.57)

Anti-bullying

3.23 The anti-bullying policy should be enhanced by including interventions for bullies and victims, and should be promoted to managers, staff and prisoners. (2.60)

Race relations, suicide prevention and anti-bullying

3.24 Managers should ensure that all staff attend required training. (2.61)

Requests and complaints

3.25 All request and complaint replies should clearly state the name of the signatory. (2.62)

Incentives and earned privileges

3.26 Procedures should be put in place to identify those with reading difficulties and to explain the compact and other essential information verbally. (2.65)

Pharmacy

3.27 A clear written policy for out-of-hours access to the health centre should be formulated, incorporating an audit trail and instructions on use of an out-of-hours record book. (2.73)

3.28 A drugs and therapeutics committee should be set up and the pharmacist at HMP Featherstone should be a member of it. (2.79)

Education

3.29 Information technology equipment should be updated to ensure that students are able to use hardware and software similar to that used outside the prison. (2.85)

Throughcare

3.30 The issue of 'police days' should be covered routinely during induction so that applications can be submitted within days of prisoners' arrival at Hewell Grange. (2.100)

Substance use strategy

3.31 The drug strategy team should make it a priority to undertake a needs assessment and to develop ongoing information systems to inform the delivery and development of services. (2.102)

3.32 The CARAT team's resettlement work should be carefully assessed to determine whether this support post-discharge increases the possibility of a positive outcome for prisoners. (2.103)

APPENDIX I

INSPECTION TEAM

Jacqui Mosley	Team leader
Steve Moffat	Inspector
Gabrielle Lee	Inspector
Joss Crosbie	Inspector

PRISON POPULATION STATISTICS

Population breakdown by:

(i) Sentence	N° of men	%
Unsentenced	0	
Less than 6 months	12	6.9
6months-less than 12 months	12	6.9
12 months-less than 2 years	14	7.9
2 years-less than 4 years	56	31.8
4 years-less than 6 years	54	30.7
6 years-less than 8 years	17	9.7
8 years-less than 10 years	7	3.9
10 years and over (less than life)	4	2.2
Life	0	0
Total	176	100

(ii) Status	N° of men	%
Sentenced	176	100
Convicted/unsentenced	0	0
Remand	0	0
Trials	0	0
Total	176	100

(iii) Main offence	No. of men	%
Murder	0	0
Att/Manslaughter	3	1.7
Violence against the person	25	14.3
Sexual offences	0	0
Burglary	21	11.9
Robbery	11	6.3
Theft & handling	5	2.8
Deception	1	0.5
Drugs offences	47	26.7
Driving offences	18	10.3
Fraud/forgery	7	3.9

Other offences:		
Arson & criminal damage	0	0
Breach of orders/licences	0	0
Perversion of justice	0	0
Possession of offensive weapon	2	1.2
Other	22	12.5
Holding warrant	14	7.9
Not known		
Total	176	100

(iv) Age	N° of men	%
18 years to 20 years	0	0
21 years to 24 years	39	22.1
25 years to 31 years	43	24.4
32 years to 37 years	43	24.4
38 years to 43 years	20	11.4
44 years to 49 years	18	10.3
50 years to 64 years	13	7.4
Total	176	100

(v) Home Area	N° of men	%
Staffordshire	15	8.6
Worcestershire	16	9.1
Cheshire	2	1.2
Cornwall	1	0.5
Shropshire	2	1.2
Derbyshire	4	2.2
Lancs	3	1.8
London	2	1.2
Warwickshire	2	1.2
Leicestershire	4	2.2
Devon	1	0.5
Wales	3	1.8
West Midlands	116	66.0
Wiltshire	1	0.5
Yorkshire	1	0.5
Foreign Nationals:		
Spain	1	0.5
Holland	1	0.5

Germany	1	0.5
Total	176	100

Ethnic group stats as at 16.6.2003

(vi) Ethnic group	N° of men	%
Asian Indian	10	5.8
Pakistani	6	3.6
Bangladeshi		
Other	12	7.1
Black African	1	0.6
Caribbean	8	4.7
Other	15	8.7
Mixed White and black Caribbean		
White and black African		
White and Asian		
Chinese		
White British	119	69.5
Irish		
Other		
Other		
Total	171	100

(vii) Religion	N° of men	%
Buddhist	3	1.7
Church of England	77	43.7
Hindu	1	0.6
Muslim	18	10.2
No religion (or not known)	36	20.5
Roman Catholic	24	13.6

Sikh	10	5.7
Jewish	1	0.6
Methodist/Free Church	6	3.4
Total	176	100