



Ministry of
JUSTICE

National Offender
Management Service

National Offender Management Service

Equalities Annual Report 2009-2010

Foreword

I am pleased to introduce this report. I am committed to ensuring that we deliver our services fairly, and to providing a public account of our efforts to do so.

Delivering a fair service to all offenders and treating staff fairly do not come easily. As we can see from the data in the annexes that is summarized in chapter 3, fairness is not the default position, and it will require hard work to address the differences in treatment that we have discovered.

This is work that is worth doing. Not just because it is the law, or the right thing to do morally, but most importantly because our core business - protecting the public and reducing reoffending - can only be delivered if we are treating prisoners and staff fairly and in accordance with their needs.

This report summarises the progress that we have made on our national programme of high level actions and our priorities for the year ahead. For the first time it also includes substantial amounts of outcome data. I am pleased to be able to publish this information and thereby to expose the ongoing challenges that we face in ensuring fairness. The report explains in broad terms what we will be doing to improve those outcomes, but real change will be achieved only by local action by managers and staff in prisons and probation trusts, making a practical difference as they go about their work in a fair decent way.

Michael Spurr

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Key Achievements 2009-2010
3. Equality Monitoring Data 2009-2010
4. Priorities for 2010-2011

Annexes

- A – Single Equality Scheme Action Plan Update
- B – Population Data
- C – Key Performance Indicator Data
- D – SMART Monitoring Data

1. Introduction

NOMS Equality Policy Statement

NOMS is committed to fairness for all. We treat our staff properly and ensure equality of opportunity. We deliver our services fairly and respond to individual needs. We insist on respectful and decent behaviour from staff, offenders and others with whom we work. We recognise that discrimination, harassment and bullying can nevertheless occur and we take prompt and appropriate action whenever we discover them.

This report is intended to show how we complied with this statement and the legislation that underpins it during 2009-2010 and to set out our plans to continue to do so during 2010-2011. It includes a report of progress on the programme of work to ensure equality in service delivery set out in our Single Equality Scheme 2009-2012, and a description of recent work on equality for staff in line with our Staff Diversity and Equality Scheme 2007-2010. The monitoring data that we have collected on outcomes for offenders is described and analysed (and included in the annexes), the separately published [Staff Diversity Review](#) is summarised, and our key priorities for 2010-2011 are explained.

'Promoting Equality in Prisons and Probation: the NOMS Single Equality Scheme 2009-2012'

Our [Single Equality Scheme 2009-2012](#) (hard copies available from Equalities Group, 3.16 Clive House, 70 Petty France, London, SW1H 9EX) was published in March 2009, and at that time we committed to reporting annually on the programme of work set out in it. An update on the Action Plan in that document is included at annex A. We intend to publish a further update at the end of 2010-2011, at which point this scheme will be brought to a close.

Staff Diversity and Equality Scheme 2007-2010

This scheme, which has now come to an end, described the actions we were taking to ensure equal treatment for our directly employed staff in prisons and at

headquarters. A description of the key recent achievements in this area is included in chapter 2.

Equality Act 2010

This legislation is replacing the requirement for public bodies to publish equality schemes with an obligation to set equalities objectives from April 2012. In anticipation of this, we will not be replacing our staff scheme and will close our service delivery scheme a year early, at the end of 2010-2011, moving to setting and reporting against objectives in 2011-2012.

A Note on Probation Areas / Trusts

Probation areas were separately subject to the equalities legislation and responsible for publishing their own equality schemes, and probation trusts will have a similar separate accountability in terms of setting and reporting on equalities objectives. This report is therefore focused on activity in prisons and at NOMS headquarters.

2. Key Achievements in 2009-2010

Equality Impact Assessments

Our twin-track approach to equality impact assessments is set out in annex G of the Single Equality Scheme, and instructions based on this – AI 4/2009 and PSI 25/2009 – were issued in September 2009. These instructions are supported by the NOMS Equality Impact Assessment Tool (NEAT) - an electronic tool that allows the user to access advice, view examples and complete the EIA template all in the same place. The tool is accompanied by a DVD which provides guidance to further support staff in completing the EIA process.

During the year both HQ policy leads and establishments began to conduct EIAs under these arrangements and the completed EIAs are available from Equalities Group, 3.16 Clive House, 70 Petty France, London, SW1H 9EX.

Probation Single Equality Schemes

During 2009-10 NOMS worked with Probation Areas and Trusts to ensure that each has in place a legally compliant Single Equality Scheme. These schemes are published on the websites of the probation trusts. Each scheme has been assessed against the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) criteria, and the EHRC has confirmed that they are satisfied with the documents. From April 2010 the 42 areas have become 35 trusts, and the new organisations will continue to be responsible for compliance with the equalities legislation. NOMS will manage this through probation trust contracts.

Equalities Monitoring Data

We have made significant improvements in our collection and use of equalities data. This is reflected in annexes C and D of this report which contain data on outcomes in service delivery that we have not previously been able to publish.

The national SMART data on race was reported quarterly to the NOMS Board, and regional reports were sent to Directors of Offender Management, with data on outcomes across their regions and in each of their establishments.

Guidance on what to do in response to this data, in the form of a flowchart of prompts and possible actions when the figures are not in the expected range, was issued to establishments. Establishments were also provided with a tool to enable monitoring of outcomes by other equalities characteristics.

Muslim Prisoner Scoping Study

Evidence from a series of recent reports by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMCIP), as well as from the fieldwork visits undertaken for the Race Review 2008, showed that the perceptions of Muslim prisoners are consistently less favourable than those of others. This finding was examined further in the Muslim Prisoner Scoping Study (MPSS) 2009 which considered whether or not there was a need for a specific strategy for Muslim prisoners.

The MPSS found evidence to support the HMCIP finding that Muslim prisoner perceptions are more negative than those of non-Muslim prisoners. However, many of the issues and concerns raised, whilst distinct in certain obvious respects, were consistent with those facing other groups of prisoners who also sometimes have aspects of their identity overlooked. The MPSS therefore concluded – in line with the approach set out in Race Review 2008 – that rather than developing a separate strategy for Muslim prisoners, the focus should be on delivering services fairly and improving staff-prisoner relationships across the board.

Whilst no separate strategy resulted from the study, the issues raised by the study's findings were tackled through a series of actions both at national level – including providing prisons with the capacity to monitor outcomes for prisoners by religious affiliation and developing and rolling out faith awareness training for staff - and locally, by each establishment working through a checklist for ensuring that the faith needs of all groups are met.

Faith Awareness Training

A Faith Awareness Training package for staff has been developed and piloted by Chaplaincy HQ. This was developed in response to an identified need for an improved awareness of faith concerns and the practice of faith in prisons.

The package consists of an interactive training session focusing on the professional duty of staff to enable good faith practice for all faiths, a DVD on searching and a small booklet entitled 'A Guide to Religious Practice in Prisons' which has been distributed to all frontline staff. It is anticipated that this will be rolled out to staff across the estate.

EHRC Action Plan

In August 2005, the Equal Opportunities Commission (now the EHRC) wrote to the Prison Service expressing its concern about the frequency and persistence of sexual harassment against women and men working for the Service and requesting detailed information on this issue. After a series of oral and written representations, the Commission announced that it would suspend a Formal Investigation on condition that the Service fulfilled an Agreement and action plan that addressed the issues raised.

During 2009-2010 we made progress on a number of these actions, including most importantly rolling out the 'Challenge It, Change It' training package on tackling unacceptable behaviour, developed for us by the Garnett Foundation.

A report on NOMS compliance with the Agreement, including an independent assessment of progress carried out by Anna Gilbert, was presented to the Commission's Legal Committee in November 2009. Whilst not all aspects of the action plan had been fully undertaken, the Committee agreed that sufficient progress and improvement had been made to justify allowing the suspension to cease, thus ending the Formal Investigation, subject to a requirement for a further progress report to the Commission to be received in November 2010.

Networks Review

Following a review, new arrangements for staff support networks for NOMS HQ and public sector prisons were agreed, for introduction from 1 April 2010.

The three networks – the Disability network, GALIPS for LGBT staff, and RESPECT for BME staff – remain in name and identity, but their constitutions are being replaced with streamlined Terms of Reference which allow for central focus and co-ordination and best practice delivery. The plan is for there to be a co-ordinator in each region, with a core time agreement, working to a service delivery agreement – agreed with the DOM – that sets out deliverables and resources in an auditable and consolidated way, allowing for cross network delivery wherever appropriate.

Independent Equalities Advisory Group

An Independent Equalities Advisory Group (IEAG) has been set up to provide external scrutiny and challenge to our work on equality. The Group is co-chaired by Lord Rosser – a former non-executive member of the NOMS board – and Farida Anderson – Chief Executive of POPS (Partners of Prisoners and Families Support Group). Membership includes the Chief Inspectors of Prisons and of Probation and representatives from the Prison Reform Trust, NACRO and Equality and Human Rights Commission. The Group meets quarterly.

3. Equality Monitoring Data

This chapter summarises patterns in the data published in the annexes and the NOMS Staff Diversity Review, highlighting differences in outcomes between groups. The key actions that are being taken to address these differences are described in chapter 4.

The data referred to is:

- Annex B – prison population data by sex, race, age and religion and belief.
- Annex C – data on several of the NOMS Key Performance Indicators, according to some of these protected characteristics. 2008-09 data is included in this section, as this has not previously been published.
- Annex D - data on outcomes for prisoners by ethnicity, gathered using the SMART system.
- The NOMS [Staff Diversity Review](#), available at.

There is other data relevant to equalities in separate publications, such as the population data in the 'Offender Management Caseload Statistics' and the assaults and self harm data in the 'Safety in Custody Statistics'. Both publications are available at <http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/5834.htm>

Prison Population

The data in Annex B show that the prison population increased by over 2,000 between April 2009 and March 2010. The growth was accounted for by an increase in the number of male prisoners: the number of women in prison decreased slightly.

The number of young people under 18 in prison decreased, whilst the numbers of adult prisoners overall increased (and the proportion aged 40 and over increased slightly).

The proportions of the prison population belonging to each ethnic and religious group remained very similar.

The numbers of prisoners for whom no ethnicity or religion data was recorded increased considerably during the year. This was the result of the implementation of a new IT system, and we will be taking action to remedy it during 2010-11. Whilst this clearly needs to be tackled, data coverage remains very good (over 98% for ethnicity and over 97% for religion in March 2010).

Data coverage on ethnicity in probation is less good, at around 93%. In the description of the Key Performance Target information, where the population under discussion is affected by this, a cautionary note has been added.

Key Performance Target Information

Annex C shows NOMS performance measures broken down by those protected characteristics for which data are collected. This section uses these figures and the relevant population data to illustrate the differences between groups.

Settled Accommodation

There were positive settled accommodation outcomes for 84% of offenders (ie all those terminating probation licences and orders or being discharged from prison). The figures were similar for men (84%) and women (83%). Amongst ethnic groups they were higher than average for Asian offenders (88%), average for White offenders, slightly lower than average for Black (82%) and Mixed (83%) offenders, and much lower than average for Chinese/Other offenders (73%). It should be noted that ethnicity data is missing for 5% of this population. Data on age and religion or belief are not available.

Employment

There were positive employment outcomes for 35% of offenders (ie all those terminating probation licences and orders or being discharged from prison). The figures were much higher for men (36%) than for women (26%). Amongst ethnic groups they were much higher than average for Asian offenders (42%), average for

White offenders, and much lower than average for Black (28%) and Mixed (28%) offenders. It should be noted that ethnicity data is missing for 4% of this population. Data on age and religion or belief are not available.

Drug Treatment Programmes

Drug treatment programmes were started by 15 per 100 of the average sentenced prisoner population, and completed by 11 per 100. The figures for women were higher for both starts (23 per 100) and completions (16 per 100) than for men (14 and 11 per 100 respectively). Amongst ethnic groups both starts and completions were lower than average for Asian (11 and 8 per 100 respectively), Black (11 and 9 per 100) and Chinese/Other (3 and 2 per 100) prisoners and higher than average for Mixed (17 and 12 per 100) and White (16 and 12 per 100) prisoners. On religion, both starts and completions were lower than average for Christian (14 and 10 per 100), Muslim (12 and 9 per 100) and Other (9 and 7 per 100) religion prisoners and higher than average for prisoners recorded as having no religion (17 and 13 per 100).

Amongst those who started programmes, 75% finished them. The figure was lower for women (71%) than for men (75%). Amongst ethnic groups, it was higher than average for Black (79%) and Asian prisoners (77%) and lower for Mixed (71%), Chinese/Other (50%). The White figure was very close to the average (74%).

Data on age was collected using categories that are different from those used in the population data, preventing comparison. This will be addressed and the same categories will be used in future years.

Offending Behaviour Programmes and Sex Offender Treatment Programmes

Offending Behaviour Programmes / Sex Offender Treatment Programmes were completed by 12 per 100 of the average sentenced prisoner population. The figures for women were lower (11 per 100) than for men (12 per 100). Amongst ethnic groups, completions for Mixed (14 per 100) and White (13 per 100) prisoners were higher than average, and for Asian (9 per 100) and Chinese/Other prisoners (3 per 100) were lower than average. On religion, completions were lower than average

for Muslim prisoners (11 per 100) and higher than average for prisoners recorded as having no religion (14 per 100). Completions for Christian and Other religions were average.

Data on age was collected using categories that are different from those used in the population data, preventing comparison. This will be addressed and the same categories will be used in future years.

Order and Licence Completions

75% of orders or licences were successfully completed. Outcomes were better for women (77%) than for men (74%). Amongst ethnic groups outcomes for Asian (79%) and Chinese/Other (82%) groups were better than average, for the Black group average, and for Mixed (70%) and White groups (74%) were worse than average. Outcomes were better for those aged over 20 (76%) than for those aged 20 and under (60%). Data on religion were not collected.

SMART data

Annex D reports on the outcomes for prisoners by ethnicity monitored using the SMART monitoring system in 2009-2010. This section uses the aggregated figures for the year and average population data to illustrate differences between ethnic groups.

Adjudications

There were an average of 159 adjudications per 100 prisoners. Black (180 per 100) and Mixed (193 per 100) prisoners were charged more often than average, White prisoners around the average (161 per 100) and Asian (110 per 100) and Other (63 per 100) less often.

15% of adjudications were dismissed. Proportionately more adjudications were dismissed for Chinese/Other prisoners (23%). All other groups were close to the average.

Complaints

There was an average of 298 complaints per 100 prisoners. Some groups complained at significantly above this rate – Black (335 per 100) and Mixed (329 per 100) – others at significantly below it – Asian (275 per 100) and Chinese/Other (131 per 100). White prisoners were close to the average (295 per 100).

Home Detention Curfew (HDC)

On average 31% of eligible prisoners were granted HDC. This includes higher proportions of eligible Asian (38%) and Mixed (34%) prisoners and lower proportions of eligible Black (28%) and Chinese/Other (18%) prisoners. White prisoners were close to the average (30%).

Incentives and Earned Privileges

On average, 1.5% of the total prison population was on the basic level of the privileges scheme. Higher proportions of Black (2.1%) and Mixed (2.5%) prisoners were on the basic regime, as were lower proportions of Asian (1.4%), Chinese/Other (0.8%) and White (1.3%) prisoners.

On average 41% of the total prison population was on the enhanced level of the privileges scheme. This included lower proportions of Black (40%), Mixed (37%) and Chinese/Other (37%) prisoners, and a higher proportion of White prisoners (42%). The figure for Asian prisoners was average.

Recategorisation

On average 4.6 prisoners per 100 of the sentenced population were recategorised up – to a higher security category – during the year. This was higher for Asian prisoners (5.0 per 100) and lower for Black (4.4 per 100), Mixed (4.3 per 100) and Chinese/Other prisoners (3.2 per 100). The figure for White prisoners was average.

On average 11 prisoners per 100 of the sentenced population were recategorised down – to a lower security category – during the year. This was higher for Asian (14 per 100) and Black (12) and lower for Mixed (10) and Chinese/Other prisoners (8 per 100). The figure for White prisoners was average (11).

Release on Temporary Licence (ROTL)

On average there were 573 days ROTL per 100 sentenced prisoners. Asian prisoners (832 per 100) were released at above this rate and Black (511), Mixed (541) and Chinese/Other (362) prisoners at below it. The White group was close to the average (570).

Segregation

Cellular confinement – for every 100 proven or referred adjudications there was an average of 43 days cellular confinement. There was a higher amount for proven or referred adjudications of Asian (51), Black (53) and Chinese / Other (46) prisoners and a lower amount for Mixed (40) and White (41) prisoners.

Good order or discipline – there were 75 days per 100 prisoners segregation for good order or discipline. Black (111) and Mixed (79) prisoners are over-represented and Chinese/Other (47) and White (69) prisoners are under-represented. The Asian group was close to the average (76).

Own protection – there were 33 days per 100 prisoners segregation for own protection. Mixed (50) and White (35) prisoners are over-represented and Asian (25), Black (24) and Chinese/Other (4) prisoners are under-represented.

Awaiting adjudication – there were 13 days segregation on rule 53 per 100 adjudications. This was higher for Asian (14), Black (15), and Chinese/Other (16) prisoners and lower for White prisoners (12).

Use of Force

Force was used 25 times per 100 prisoners. There was proportionately more force used on Black (42 per 100) and Mixed (36 per 100) prisoners, and less on Asian (18 per 100), Chinese/Other (16 per 100) and White (22 per 100) prisoners.

Service Delivery Data Analysis

In terms of ethnicity, the data shows a reasonably consistent pattern between prisoners of different groups:

- Asian prisoners: for the most part outcomes are better than average;
- Black and Mixed prisoners: outcomes tend to be worse than average;
- Chinese/Other prisoners: a more nuanced picture – broadly, prisoners in this group tend to be subject to fewer behaviour management processes (adjudications, basic IEP, segregation for reasons of Good Order or Discipline and use of force) but also to be under-represented in positive outcomes such as HDC and ROTL;
- White prisoners: outcomes tend to be around the average, and in some functions are better than average.

Explaining Differences By Ethnic Group

These differences in outcomes are the result of a number of factors. There are some relevant differences in the composition of the ethnic groups in the prison population. For example the Mixed group is on average considerably younger than the rest of the population, and the Chinese/Other group contains a much higher proportion of foreign national prisoners than the rest of the population. The ‘Safety in Custody Statistics’ referred to above indicate that age and time in prison, which vary between groups, are important factors in the incidence of assaults and fighting in prisons, which influences a number of these outcomes, such as adjudications, segregation and use of force.

All of these outcomes occur at the end of processes that involve a series of interactions between prisoners and staff, as well as staff and/or management decisions and action, and detailed work is needed to isolate the reasons for particular patterns. These processes also vary between establishments, so some of this work needs to be done locally, as well as by looking at the national figures. The twin-track approach to equality impact assessments described in chapter 2 is designed to ensure that this work takes place at both national and local levels.

In accounting for continuing differences in outcomes between different groups 'Race Review 2008' found that instances of blatant, explicit racism were uncommon, and located the causes instead in more subtle forms of discrimination, including the operation of unconscious bias in the use of discretion by staff and managers. This is likely to be a factor in the differences in outcomes between ethnic groups reported here and forms the basis of some of the programme of action to tackle them described in chapter 4.

Employment Data

The [Staff Diversity Review](#) can be found at. The executive summary is provided here.

Ethnicity

In 2009/10 NOMS successfully met the BME representation target for the second successive year. As at 31 March 2010, 6.5 per cent of staff employed directly by NOMS were BME against a target of 6.4 per cent. Four in ten BME staff were Black and three in ten were Asian. Given the very limited recruitment expected in 2010/11 as a result of budget constraints, the 2010/11 target has been set at 6.5 per cent. As at 30 November 2010, 6.57 per cent of NOMS staff were BME.

Recruitment controls have led to an overall reduction in the number of people joining the Service. However, there has been an increase in the proportion of BME recruits. Encouragingly, BME people are joining the Service at the manager level – one in five new managers were BME in 2009-2010. However, although BME males and females join the Service in equal number, BME females are almost twice as likely to join in a managerial position compared to their male contemporaries - most of whom join as prison officers or operational support grades.

The gap in relation to Staff Performance and Development Record markings has continued and BME staff still receive a lower proportion of exceeded box markings compared to their White contemporaries. Further analysis showed that the ethnicity of the manager awarding the marking does not impact on the box marking given.

That is, both White and BME managers are more likely to award White staff an exceeded box marking compared to BME staff.

Promotion rates between BME and White staff have fallen at a similar rate. However, BME staff are less likely to be promoted across all grades and this is most pronounced at the administrative senior manager level where no BME promotions were made.

In a selection of areas the outcome for BME staff was more favourable than White, and in others the outcome between the two groups was equitable. For example, sickness absence rates between BME and White staff are equal and absence management action showed little difference by ethnicity. BME staff were slightly more likely to receive a bonus payment compared to their White colleagues. Similarly, BME staff were also more likely to receive a cover payment compared to their White counterparts.

In general, BME staff were no more likely to raise a grievance than White staff. However, segmentation by location showed BME staff based at establishments were much more likely to raise a grievance compared to White staff. A similar trend was evident within conduct and discipline action. Despite finding only a small overall difference between BME and White staff – segmentation by location showed BME staff working in establishments were more likely to be subject to conduct and discipline action compared to White staff.

Consistent with last years findings BME staff have a higher level of employee engagement compared to their White contemporaries and tend to be more positive across all staff survey statements. However, BME staff are more likely to state that they have been bullied, harassed or discriminated against compared to their White colleagues.

Traditionally, BME staff have higher leaving rates compared to White staff. This year, although the trend has continued, leaving rates have begun to converge and the difference between the two groups is now less than 0.5 percentage points and

not statistically significant. However, analysis by grade group showed that BME non-operational staff were significantly more likely to leave the Service compared to White staff.

Gender

The proportion of NOMS female staff has remained consistent to previous years – 36 per cent. Variation by grade is again evident; female representation is highest within non-unified grades. Despite the large numbers of females within administrative posts, they have a higher concentration in the lower grades.

This year fewer females joined the Service, however it is likely that this is due to the general reduction in recruitment across administrative grades owing to recruitment controls which typically attract a large proportion of females. That being said, females are accessing the top tiers of the organisation – five of the eight SCS appointments made during 2009/10 were awarded to females.

Females continue to be more likely to receive an exceeded SPDR box marking and the variance has increased by almost half a per cent since 2008/09. Females also receive more cover payments than men. The advantage for females is also seen within special bonuses, and the difference here is significant.

Within promotion although unified grade females continue to do slightly better than their male contemporaries, the rates have begun to converge. However, males appear to have a greater likelihood of being promoted among admin grades. Further segmentation by grade shows this disparity is only apparent at the lower grades - the female advantage is restored at the senior manager level.

Females have again shown a higher level of employee engagement compared to males. This trend tended to persist throughout the survey and females typically rated statements more positively than their male contemporaries. Findings revealed that males were more likely to claim that they had personally experienced bullying, harassment or discrimination over the past year.

Overall, females were slightly more likely to raise a grievance, however this trend was only evident in establishments. Within HQ, males were three times as likely to raise a grievance compared to females. Males were significantly more likely to be subject to conduct and discipline cases. The difference was most stark in establishments where men were almost three times as likely to be subject to action compared to their female colleagues.

Consistent with the pattern found in 2008/09, females had a higher sickness absence rate compared to their male counterparts. This difference holds even after pregnancy related illnesses have been accounted for and is evident across all grades.

Females continue to leave at a higher rate than males; however a lot of this difference is due to the traditionally high leaving rates found in grades with high female occupancy such as healthcare and psychology. Once the grade differentials have been accounted for, the variance between males and females reduces by more than half.

Disability

Almost six per cent of staff declared themselves as disabled. At 5.4 per cent, representation is slightly lower among unified grades compared to non-unified grades (7.1 per cent). However, both grades showed evidence of decreasing disability representation as seniority rises. With 44 per cent of staff not declaring their disability status non-disclosure amongst staff remains an issue. The picture amongst new joiners is somewhat different, non disclosure rates among this cohort have significantly reduced over the last twelve months.

Consistent to findings in 2008/09, disabled staff are significantly less likely to receive an exceeded SPDR marking compared to their non-disabled counterparts and this tends to persist across all variables. Disabled staff are also less likely to receive a cover payment compared to their non-disabled contemporaries. The

difference is greatest at the senior manager level where no declared disabled staff received cover payments.

There are however some areas where disabled staff do as well as, or in some instances better than, their non-disabled colleagues. For example, promotion rates within NOMS have reduced throughout 2009/10, and for the first time there is no difference in the likelihood of promotion between disabled and non-disabled administrative staff. Further still, although the average amount awarded is slightly lower, disabled staff were more likely to receive a special bonus compared to their non-disabled counterparts.

Despite these findings there are some areas where disparity persists. The staff survey revealed a lower level of engagement among disabled staff. This pattern was evident throughout the survey and disabled staff almost consistently reported lower positive ratings than non-disabled staff. The areas with the biggest variance included being treated with fairness and respect, where disabled staff had positive ratings almost twenty percentage points lower than their non-disabled counterparts. Survey findings also showed disabled staff were twice as likely to report they had personally experienced bullying, harassment or discrimination over the last 12 months.

Following on from the staff survey findings, staff with a disability were more than twice as likely to raise a grievance compared to those who were non-disabled and this trend was seen throughout establishments and NOMS HQ.

Staff with a disability continue to have higher sickness absence rates than those who are non-disabled, although the gap has reduced in recent years.

In line with previous years, disabled staff are significantly more likely to leave NOMS compared to their non-disabled contemporaries. The reasons disabled staff leave are notably different. Disabled staff are more likely to leave due to medical retirement or ill health/attendance dismissal, whilst almost three quarters of non-

disabled staff leave due to resignation or transfer to another government department.

Age

The average age of NOMS staff is 43.8, slightly up on last year. Overall, the age profile remains relatively unchanged. Males on average are older than females and unified staff tend to be slightly younger than those within non-unified grades.

SPDR exceeded ratings are significantly higher amongst staff over 50, and this tends to persist across most variables. Employees over 50 are more likely to receive a special bonus payment and when they do it is typically higher than that awarded to staff under 50. However, this pattern is largely driven by grade and length of service.

There are a number of areas in which younger staff outperform those in the older cohort. For example, promotion rates peak amongst staff in their 30s and steadily decline from that point on. Indeed, within HQ staff those aged under 40 are twice as likely to be promoted compared to older colleagues. Similarly cover payments are most common amongst staff in their 30s – the volume steadily declines after this point.

In line with last years findings, employee engagement is highest amongst younger staff and gradually falls before rising amongst the over 60s. Survey statements overall tend to follow a similar pattern and younger staff are typically more positive than their older contemporaries.

Staff in their 40s and 50s are far more likely to raise a grievance than those in the youngest and oldest age groups. However, those in the oldest and youngest age groups were more likely to raise a grievance that cites age as the reason compared to those in their 40s and 50s. Conduct and discipline data revealed staff under 40 are significantly more likely to be subject to action compared to those over 40. However, segmenting the findings by grade showed this finding only continues

among operational grades. Amongst non-operational grades it is those over 40 that have a greater likelihood of being subject to conduct and discipline action.

Younger staff continue to have a higher leaving rate than older staff and this persists across both grade groups. Across all grades, under 30s are twice as likely to leave the Service compared to those over 30.

4. Priorities for 2010-2011

In 2010-2011 we will be continuing work on the action plan published in the Single Equality Scheme and the sexual harassment action plan agreed with the EHRC. We will also develop a series of measures to address the issues of disproportionality identified in the data published in this report.

This section describes some of the most important elements of the work that we will be undertaking in 2010-2011.

Equality Policy Framework

We are committed to producing a policy statement and a comprehensive set of instructions that is legally compliant and effective in driving action. This work was not completed in 2009-2010 because of the need for it to reflect the requirements of the Equality Act 2010. The work will now go forward, with Agency and Prison Service Instructions on ensuring equality in both the treatment of staff and service delivery. In line with the general approach of the NOMS agency, the instructions will focus on the mandatory requirements only, ensuring that compliance can be measured, and will be supported by comprehensive guidance for staff.

Monitoring Data

We will continue our work to broaden the range of monitoring data that is collected. This includes improving the coverage of the prison data by including more protected characteristics, such as disability (where data coverage is currently too low to allow meaningful analysis) and sexual orientation (which has not previously been collected). We will also be exploring options for collecting further national data on probation outcomes.

Equality Impact Assessments

We will continue to pursue the twin-track approach to equality impact assessments set out in annex G of the Single Equality Scheme, and AI 4/2009 and PSI 25/2009. HQ policy leads will complete and publish EIAs on all new and revised national policies, and establishments will devise and work through prioritised local

programmes. Further guidance will be provided to managers completing EIAs, for instance on effective stakeholder consultation, and good practice examples will be shared to improve quality.

The [completed EIAs](#) will be published as they are completed through the year and available from Equalities Group, 3.16 Clive House, 70 Petty France, London, SW1H 9EX.

Structured Communication in Prisons

Building on learning from the aviation, medical and military sectors, we have developed a suite of tools that are designed to help staff to achieve greater consistency, and therefore operational effectiveness. We believe that, as well as bringing improved overall performance, these tools will help to reduce the incidence of unequal outcomes caused by unconscious bias in the use of discretion. We will be testing and refining these tools in a number of prisons during 2010-2011 and commissioning an external evaluation of them.

EHRC Action Plan on Sexual Harassment

Work on this plan will continue, for example through the development of a training module on conducting investigations into allegations of discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and through further effort to ensure that the 'Challenge It, Change It' training is rolled out to all establishment Senior Management Team members by December 2010 and all staff in NOMS by December 2011. As agreed, a further progress report will be submitted to the Commission in November 2010.

Networks

Following the review described in chapter 2, the networks will work to ensure that a Service Delivery Agreement (SDA) is agreed with the DOM in each region, setting out deliverables and resources in an auditable and consolidated way, allowing for cross network delivery wherever appropriate. These outcomes will reflect on the central business plan but also allow for a regional perspective and focus on issues which are specific to the region and not reflected nationally. The network co-ordinators will work to the SDA and their local action plan (which will feed into the

regional diversity plan), organising activities on the ground and linking up with the regional diversity managers, national network organisers and HR team.

Tackling Disparities

Our approach to tackling the differences between groups highlighted by the data published in this report continues to be that described in 'Race Review 2008' and our Single Equality Scheme. This includes:

- The Equality Impact Assessment process – this is the main tool for managing equalities issues locally. Establishments will be prioritising functions and working through a process that helps them to generate local action plans. We would expect functions where disparities are identified locally to be prioritised and to see this process generating either explanations for the disparity or actions to tackle it.
- The use of discretion and unconscious bias – 'Race Review 2008' argued that "we need to turn our attention to tackling more subtle forms of discrimination, to ensuring that discretion is sensitised to race". We will be developing and piloting materials that encourage managers and staff to engage with the idea of unconscious bias and the ways in which it may be influencing behaviour. These will include:
 - presentations for Governors and senior management teams;
 - training materials for managers, including some preparatory work undertaking the Implicit Association Test and then a classroom session to discuss the implications of their results;
 - a special issue of the Prison Service Journal with a series of articles exploring disproportionality and implicit bias.
- The 'Structured Communication in Prisons' tools described above.

SPDR markings

One of the more troubling findings of the Staff Diversity Review is the difference in SPDR markings: White staff are 50% more likely to achieve an 'exceeded' marking, and this has been the case consistently for several years. The further analysis showing that this is the case regardless of the ethnicity of the manager awarding the

marking supports the conclusion that this is not the result of explicit racism, but of more subtle processes such as the operation of unconscious bias in the use of discretion. For this reason we will be taking forward work to make the SPDR process more structured, and to increase the accountability of those giving markings through the use of moderation panels.

Annex A - Single Equality Scheme Action Plan Update

Outcome	Action	Responsible Owner	Completion Date	Progress Status
Policy				
<i>Comprehensive policy framework that is legally compliant and effective in driving action</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Produce national policy statement for NOMS 	Equalities Group	30 September 2010	Completed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review policy documents for prison establishments and probation areas (PSOs, PSIs and PCs) across all equalities issues and develop coherent and comprehensive policy framework 	Equalities Group	31 March 2011	Ongoing. A review of policy documents has been conducted and draft Agency Instructions and Prison Service Instructions on ensuring equality for staff and in service delivery are in development. This action has been delayed whilst we awaited the passage of the Equality Act 2010 before finalising details. No instruction will be issued for probation as the probation trust contract is sufficient to ensure legal compliance and drive action.
Performance Management				
<i>Appropriate measures in place, with monitoring of performance against them and support for improvement</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor and support prison performance against KPT 	Equalities Group / DOMs	Ongoing	Ongoing
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce revised visitor survey to KPT 	Equalities Group	30 September 2009	Completed. Revised visitor survey developed. However, the performance management arrangements are subject to further review and the new survey will not form a part of the KPT.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess probation area SESs 	Equalities Group	30 June 2009	Completed. All 42 probation areas were supported in the development of compliant Single Equality Schemes.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Devise KPT for probation areas on race/equalities issues 	Equalities Group	31 March 2010	Postponed. After further consideration it was decided to give priority to ensuring that probation monitoring data is available and analysed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor and support probation area performance against KPT 	Equalities Group / DOMs	30 June 2010 and ongoing	No longer applicable. No KPT has been developed.

Outcome	Action	Responsible Owner	Completion Date	Progress Status
Involvement and Consultation				
<i>Effective mechanism for involving and consulting with stakeholders from all groups</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review existing national arrangements, including Race Advisory Group, and ensure effective and consistent approach across all equalities issues 	Equalities Group / Directorate of Commissioning and Operational Policy	31 March 2010	Completed. In order to gain advice and support from our stakeholders, NOMS has established an Independent Equalities Advisory Group, which includes representatives from groups with interests and expertise in each of the equalities issues.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider prison establishment level involvement and consultation arrangements and develop new framework, building on prisoner and external representation on REATs 	Equalities Group / Directorate of Commissioning and Operational Policy	31 March 2010	Completed. Proposals for new arrangements form part of the policy framework described above.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement new framework 	Directors of Offender Management	31 March 2011	On track for implementation by this date.
Prison Establishment Management Arrangements				
<i>Effective arrangements for managing equalities issues in place in all prisons</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review management arrangements to ensure effective and consistent approach, building on success of REATs on race issues 	Equalities Group	31 March 2010	Completed. Proposals for new management arrangements form part of the policy framework described above.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider diversity roles – Diversity Manager, REO, DLO etc – with a view to greater consistency and more effective working 	Equalities Group	31 March 2010	Completed. Proposals for new management arrangements form part of the policy framework described above.
		DOM's	31 March 2011	On track for implementation by this date.

Outcome	Action	Responsible Owner	Completion Date	Progress Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement new framework 			
Awareness and Promotion				
<i>Staff fully aware of responsibilities and diversity promoted effectively to prisoners</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training for staff is covered in the Staff SES 	Equalities Group	Ongoing	Ongoing. Challenge It Change It training has been rolled out with a target of delivery to all staff by December 2011.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Devise and disseminate good practice guidance on prisoner induction 	Equalities Group	30 September 2010	Ongoing.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop diversity training materials for use with prisoners and disseminate to establishments 	Equalities Group	31 May 2010	Completed. The Racially Motivated Offender Training Package has been made available to all prisons. This includes generic diversity training suitable for all prisoners.
Monitoring				
<i>Comprehensive and accurate monitoring data on all strands that is sensitively handled and effectively analysed and used</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with P-NOMIS programme to develop IT capacity for monitoring of all strands in prisons 	Equalities Group	31 March 2011	Ongoing. Current version of P-NOMIS has designated fields for gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation and religion & belief. Guidance on collecting and entering Disability Data has been issued. Further guidance on collecting and handling sensitive information will be developed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review arrangements for data sharing – improving functionality of partnership working and meeting Data Protection Act requirements 	Equalities Group	31 March 2010	Ongoing. Equalities Group has initiated work with the Information Advice Division in the Ministry of Justice to ensure data sharing arrangements support equality data collection. Guidance is due to be published in the 2010-11 business year.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of review reception and induction arrangements in prisons, put in place more 	Equalities Group	31 March 2010	Ongoing. Guidance on the collection and treatment of sensitive information will be issued in the business year 2010-11.

Outcome	Action	Responsible Owner	Completion Date	Progress Status
	<p>sensitive way of capturing accurate monitoring data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review probation monitoring arrangements with a view to introducing monitoring of all strands Ensure publication of monitoring data in appropriate formats 	<p>Equalities Group</p> <p>Equalities Group / Internal Communications</p>	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>30 September 2009 and ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing. Probation currently collect gender, ethnicity, disability and age related data. Equalities Group are working with Business Change team to ensure the Probation Case Management System is able to meet the requirement to capture equality data and will develop guidance on equality monitoring for probation trusts.</p> <p>Ongoing. 2009-2010 data is published in this report.</p>
Equality Impact Assessments				
<p><i>All national policies and functions are subject to EIA, and all delivery units are conducting EIAs of areas where local issues arise</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce new arrangements described in annex J Complete national EIAs to programme set out in annex K Equalities Group support for policy leads conducting national EIAs Equalities Group guidance for delivery units conducting local EIAs Complete local EIAs to agreed schedules 	<p>Equalities Group</p> <p>Directors</p> <p>Equalities Group</p> <p>Equalities Group</p> <p>Directors of Offender Management</p>	<p>30 September 2009</p> <p>According to programme</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>30 September 2009 and ongoing</p> <p>30 September 2009 and ongoing</p>	<p>Completed. PSI 25/2009 & AI 4/2009 issued.</p> <p>Ongoing. Publication arrangements described in chapter 2.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Completed. Electronic tool (NEAT) and supporting DVD published along with guidance.</p> <p>Ongoing. Establishment schedules agreed. Publication arrangements described in chapter 2.</p>

Outcome	Action	Responsible Owner	Completion Date	Progress Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure publication of EIAs in appropriate formats 	Equalities Group / Internal Communications	30 September 2009 and ongoing	Ongoing.
Complaints and Incident Reporting				
<i>Effective system for making complaints/reporting incidents for all strands</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop system to ensure that complaints and incidents relating to all equalities issues can be reported and recorded, building on learning from RIRF system 	Equalities Group	31 March 2011	Ongoing. Proposals for a new complaints and incident reporting system form part of the policy framework described above.
<i>Address findings of Race Review 2008 around fear of victimisation, outcomes and lack of prisoner confidence, and apply across all equalities issues.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issue good practice guidance and toolkit 	Equalities Group	30 September 2010	The good practice guidance and toolkit have been developed and will be issued when the new system is in place.
Procurement and Partnerships				
<i>Ensure duties are met in delivery of all services that are procured or delivered in partnership</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify contracts where the risk of not meeting our equalities duties may be high and ensure that effective systems and processes are put in place to monitor compliance with equalities legislation; 	Procurement Directorate	31 March 2010	Ongoing. High risk contracts – for example the probation trust contracts – have strong equalities clauses, including regular reporting to ensure compliance.

Outcome	Action	Responsible Owner	Completion Date	Progress Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that an equality clause is included in all new contracts that are awarded 	Procurement Directorate	30 September 2009 and ongoing	Ongoing.
Race				
<i>Ensure continued compliance with duties by addressing key areas for further action identified in Race Review 2008 around communication; management and leadership; and use of discretion.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Produce and issue good practice guidance on the role of prisoner race representatives 	Equalities Group	31 March 2011	Ongoing. NACRO have been commissioned to produce Prisoner Equality Representative guidance and training.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and test a structured communication tool 	Equalities Group	31 March 2011	Ongoing. Three structured communication tools developed. These will be piloted in a number of sites with an externally commissioned evaluation to assess effectiveness.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved communication of ethnic monitoring data and analysis 	Equalities Group	31 March 2010	Ongoing. Quarterly regional reports for DOMS include data from a number of sources. Recent enhancements to this report include a summary of SMART data and the inclusion of centrally held demographic data.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved support for Governors and REATs in using ethnic monitoring tools 	Equalities Group	30 September 2010	Ongoing. Guidance on interpreting SMART data and identifying actions to address disproportionality issued. Equalities Group has begun a programme of support for regions, providing more detailed analysis of the data and attending regional meetings to discuss the issues identified by it.
Disability				
<i>Ensure compliance with duties</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Through policy measures above ensure appropriate revision to framework set out in PSO2855 	Equalities Group	31 March 2011	Ongoing. This forms part of the policy framework described above.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure involvement of disabled prisoners and other relevant 	Equalities Group	31 March 2011	Ongoing. Proposals for new management arrangements form part of the policy framework described above.

Outcome	Action	Responsible Owner	Completion Date	Progress Status
	<p>stakeholders through changes to establishment management arrangements described above</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce comprehensive screening for learning disabilities 	Offender Learning and Skills	1 August 2009	Achieved. All offenders undertaking learning activities are screened.
Gender				
<i>Ensure compliance with duties</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that new EIA arrangements are effective in ensuring that specific needs of women prisoners are met 	Women's Team	Ongoing	Ongoing.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the programmes in place in some women's prisons aiming to reduce self harm to assess effectiveness for the different women's populations. 	Women's Team / Directors of Offender Management	31 March 2010	Completed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gain accreditation for women specific offending behaviour programme – CARE – and roll out delivery 	Rehabilitation Services Group / Directors of Offender Management	31 March 2011	Completed. CARE now accredited.
Gender Identity				
<i>Ensure compliance with duties</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Through policy measures above ensure appropriate arrangements for management and care of transgender prisoners 	Equalities Group / Women's Team	31 March 2011	Ongoing. PSI on care and management of transsexual prisoners is being redrafted to reflect legal developments.
Age (Younger Prisoners)				

Outcome	Action	Responsible Owner	Completion Date	Progress Status
<i>Ensure fair treatment, and in particular that the needs of younger prisoners are met</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement recommendations of reviews of restraint and of safeguarding 	Young People's Team / Directors of Offender Management	31 March 2010	Completed.
Age (Older Prisoners)				
<i>Ensure fair treatment, and in particular that the needs of older offenders are met</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Through policy measures above ensure appropriate arrangements for management of older prisoners, including separation of issue from that of disability as appropriate 	Equalities Group	31 March 2011	Ongoing. Proposals for new management arrangements form part of draft PSI that is currently under consideration. The revised policy will be issued by 30 September 2010.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share good practice with regard to services for older prisoners 	Equalities Group	31 March 2010	Completed. NACRO have revised and published a toolkit / resource pack and delivered 15 workshops in prisons.
Sexual Orientation				
<i>Ensure fair treatment and in particular that LGB prisoners are protected from harassment</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify best method of collection of sexual orientation data through small scale pilot project 	Equalities Group	31 March 2011	Ongoing. A pilot project is being developed in conjunction with Stonewall.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share good practice on management of gay prisoners, including gay prisoner forums and safeguarding measures 	Equalities Group	31 March 2010	Completed. Good practice guidance - developed in conjunction with NACRO - has been issued.
Religion and Belief				
<i>Ensure fair</i>	Revise PSO4550 on Religion	Chaplaincy	31 March 2011	Ongoing.

Outcome	Action	Responsible Owner	Completion Date	Progress Status
<i>treatment and that the needs of prisoners of all faith groups are met.</i>	Continue to work to improve provision for all faith groups	Chaplaincy / DOM's	Ongoing	Ongoing.
<i>Explore further the reasons for the less positive perceptions of Muslim prisoners and develop appropriate action to address this issue.</i>	Introduce faith awareness training for staff	Training Services / Chaplaincy	30 September 2009	Completed. Faith awareness course successfully piloted and made available.
	Complete scoping work on Muslim prisoner issues and propose next steps	Equalities Group	30 September 2009	Scoping study completed and recommendations actioned.

Annex B - Contents

Sheet	Table
1	Prison Population
2	Sentenced Prison Population

Table 1

Prison Population

	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Jul-09	Aug-09	Sep-09	Oct-09	Nov-09	Dec-09	Jan-10	Feb-10	Mar-10
All Prisoners	82,833	82,815	83,391	83,962	84,180	84,409	84,622	84,647	84,231	83,378	83,925	85,184
Sex												
Female	4,299	4,242	4,307	4,332	4,262	4,233	4,293	4,278	4,259	4,125	4,224	4,290
Male	78,534	78,573	79,084	79,630	79,918	80,176	80,329	80,369	79,972	79,253	79,701	80,894
Race												
Asian	6,032	6,054	6,040	6,129	6,111	6,162	6,189	6,233	6,149	6,023	6,033	6,060
Black	12,095	12,089	12,099	12,013	11,940	12,035	12,010	12,061	12,041	11,828	11,856	11,915
Mixed	2,816	2,777	2,846	2,841	2,875	2,865	2,938	2,965	2,963	2,926	2,937	2,993
Other	1,312	1,364	1,448	1,414	1,434	1,386	1,446	1,425	1,381	1,332	1,326	1,299
White	60,326	60,303	60,718	61,279	61,445	61,496	61,417	61,398	61,007	60,305	60,686	61,706
Not Stated	203	196	215	157	155	149	141	140	135	125	125	130
No Record	49	32	25	129	220	316	481	425	555	839	962	1,081
Age												
Under 18	2,156	2,114	2,120	2,083	2,070	2,134	2,050	1,960	1,879	1,705	1,699	1,726
18-20	8,694	8,651	8,781	8,965	9,017	8,916	8,840	8,772	8,732	8,514	8,565	8,694
21-24	13,706	13,760	13,915	14,073	14,160	14,188	14,276	14,296	14,144	14,025	14,075	14,310
25-29	15,628	15,525	15,463	15,556	15,631	15,673	15,678	15,695	15,574	15,592	15,704	15,930
30-39	21,591	21,631	21,699	21,767	21,786	21,827	21,857	21,951	21,855	21,633	21,818	22,162
40-49	13,648	13,671	13,865	13,915	13,910	14,006	14,165	14,159	14,180	14,043	14,098	14,240
50+	7,410	7,463	7,548	7,603	7,606	7,665	7,756	7,814	7,867	7,866	7,966	8,122
Religion and belief												
Christian	40,270	40,104	40,296	40,336	40,236	40,227	40,344	40,408	40,166	39,857	40,160	41,096
Muslim	9,907	9,894	9,932	9,996	10,141	10,194	10,274	10,323	10,325	10,267	10,318	10,358
Other	3,900	3,923	3,923	3,999	4,019	4,030	4,067	4,107	4,072	3,999	4,016	3,993
No religion	28,725	28,859	29,201	29,474	29,304	29,252	29,142	28,791	28,335	27,741	27,737	27,694
No Record	31	35	39	157	480	706	795	1,018	1,333	1,514	1,694	2,043

.. Indicates data unavailable

Population snapshots were taken on 30th April, 31st May, 30th June, 31st July, 28th August, 25th September, 30th October, 27th November, 18th December, 29th January, 26th February and 31st March.

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from administrative IT systems. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate to that level.

Table 2

Sentenced Prison Population

	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Jul-09	Aug-09	Sep-09	Oct-09	Nov-09	Dec-09	Jan-10	Feb-10	Mar-10
All Prisoners	68,315	67,983	68,411	69,123	69,184	69,420	69,885	70,146	70,344	69,409	70,116	71,352
Sex												
Female	3,483	3,418	3,396	3,420	3,395	3,338	3,410	3,431	3,410	3,312	3,413	3,487
Male	64,832	64,565	65,015	65,703	65,789	66,082	66,475	66,715	66,934	66,097	66,703	67,865
Race												
Asian	4,564	4,526	4,537	4,621	4,613	4,643	4,654	4,735	4,748	4,680	4,746	4,767
Black	9,413	9,409	9,414	9,402	9,355	9,368	9,384	9,363	9,486	9,339	9,385	9,487
Mixed	2,289	2,265	2,263	2,292	2,282	2,313	2,385	2,430	2,447	2,414	2,412	2,456
Other	772	789	836	832	846	844	887	879	869	848	836	818
White	51,047	50,789	51,168	51,739	51,810	51,893	52,075	52,280	52,238	51,418	51,922	52,916
Not Stated	154	148	141	140	144	139	128	126	122	113	113	114
No Record	76	57	52	97	134	220	372	333	434	597	702	794
Age												
Under 18	1,643	1,595	1,578	1,571	1,553	1,593	1,575	1,520	1,456	1,249	1,239	1,251
18-20	6,629	6,553	6,666	6,821	6,808	6,778	6,751	6,721	6,733	6,549	6,613	6,799
21-24	11,120	11,133	11,253	11,460	11,428	11,492	11,607	11,684	11,712	11,591	11,673	11,908
25-29	12,806	12,718	12,654	12,767	12,828	12,864	12,914	13,005	12,990	12,928	13,045	13,233
30-39	17,801	17,739	17,825	17,946	18,019	18,004	18,045	18,160	18,200	17,939	18,186	18,483
40-49	11,617	11,551	11,698	11,775	11,756	11,819	12,041	12,044	12,186	12,082	12,176	12,336
50+	6,699	6,694	6,737	6,791	6,792	6,870	6,952	7,012	7,067	7,071	7,184	7,342
Religion and belief												
Christian	34,094	33,817	33,714	33,982	33,886	33,858	34,051	34,193	34,234	33,846	34,140	35,051
Muslim	7,758	7,720	7,816	7,906	7,992	8,061	8,104	8,136	8,244	8,190	8,267	8,330
No religion	23,175	23,150	23,523	23,792	23,601	23,718	23,840	23,749	23,599	23,011	23,166	23,279
Other	3,259	3,263	3,332	3,360	3,467	3,393	3,432	3,468	3,461	3,409	3,450	3,432
No Record	29	33	26	83	238	390	458	600	806	953	1,093	1,260

Population snapshots were taken on 30th April, 31st May, 30th June, 31st July, 28th August, 25th September, 30th October, 27th November, 18th December, 29th January, 26th February and 31st March.

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from administrative IT systems. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate to that level.

Annex C - Contents

Sheet	Table
1	Resettlement and Settled accommodation
2	Resettlement and Employment
3	Drug Treatment Programme Completions
4	OBP and SOTP Completions
5	Accredited Offender Behavioural programmes in the community and those that met the OGRS eligibility criteria
6	Orders or Licences Successfully Completed
7	Prisoners recorded as being an assailant in KPI serious assault incidents
8	Prisoners recorded as being a victim in KPI serious assault incidents

Resettlement and Settled accommodation

	2008/09						2009/10					
	Prison and Probation		Prison		Probation		Prison and Probation		Prison		Probation	
	discharges/ terminations	positive accommodation outcomes	discharges (less than 12 month sentence)	positive accommodation outcomes	terminated orders and licences	positive accommodation outcomes	discharges/ terminations	positive accommodation outcomes	discharges (less than 12 month sentence)	positive accommodation outcomes	terminated orders and licences	positive accommodation outcomes
All	88,503	68,820	139,304	117,303	52,493	46,135	86,811	71,168
Sex												
Female	12,522	9,661	16,888	14,054	4,450	3,880	12,438	10,174
Male	75,975	59,155	122,414	103,248	48,043	42,255	74,371	60,993
Not Known	6	4	2	1	0	0	2	1
Race												
Asian or Asian British	3,434	2,875	6,705	5,870	2,932	2,589	3,773	3,281
Black or Black British	4,900	3,601	9,797	7,988	4,112	3,557	5,685	4,431
Mixed	2,000	1,511	3,541	2,939	1,383	1,222	2,158	1,717
Chinese or Other	532	377	1,181	868	556	399	625	469
White	70,410	54,606	111,677	94,266	43,183	38,066	68,494	56,200
Not Known	7,227	5,850	6,403	5,372	327	302	6,076	5,070

The KPI for 2009/10 was only introduced in that year, for 2008/09 discharges of offenders with sentences under 12 months were not separated from overall discharge figures.

Positive settled accommodation outcomes include bail/probation hostel, permanent housing and supported housing.

No age breakdown is available.

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from administrative IT systems. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate to that level.

Resettlement and Employment

	2008/09						2009/10					
	Prison and Probation		Prison		Probation		Prison and Probation		Prison		Probation	
	discharges/ terminations	positive employment outcomes	discharges (less than 12 month sentence)	positive employment outcomes	terminated orders and licences	positive employment outcomes	discharges/ terminations	positive employment outcomes	discharges (less than 12 month sentence)	positive employment outcomes	terminated orders and licences	positive employment outcomes
All	74,290	32,904	127,612	44,670	52,493	12,871	75,119	31,799
Sex												
Female	8,968	2,552	14,169	3,717	4,450	447	9,719	3,270
Male	65,317	30,350	113,442	40,952	48,043	12,424	65,399	28,528
Not Known	5	2	1	1	0	0	1	1
Race												
Asian or Asian British	3,158	1,584	6,369	2,649	2,932	891	3,437	1,758
Black or Black British	4,450	1,499	9,159	2,600	4,112	854	5,047	1,746
Mixed	1,786	578	3,332	932	1,383	270	1,949	662
Chinese or Other	454	195	1,077	368	556	142	521	226
White	58,278	25,950	102,294	35,566	43,183	10,624	59,111	24,942
Not Known	6,164	3,098	5,381	2,555	327	90	5,054	2,465

The KPI for 2009/10 was only introduced in that year, so for 2008/09 discharges of offenders with sentences under 12 months were not separated from overall discharge figures.

Positive employment outcomes include full time work, part time work and temporary/casual work.

No age breakdown is available

Probation figures for 2009/10 have been calibrated to reconcile with the published totals in the annual report.

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from administrative IT systems. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate to that level.

Drug Treatment Programme Completions

	2008/09		2009/10	
	DTP starts	DTP completions	DTP starts	DTP completions
All	10881	8054	10206	7629
Sex				
Female	787	547	790	558
Male	10,094	7,507	9,416	7,071
Race				
Asian or Asian British	532	395	511	394
Black or Black British	1,169	852	1,081	851
Mixed	392	280	392	279
Chinese or Other	39	18	28	14
White	8,739	6,493	8,172	6,074
Not Known	10	16	22	17
No Record	0	0	0	0
Age				
Under 18	2	1	0	0
18-21	1,538	1,153	1,520	1,080
22-26	2,672	1,890	2,560	1,853
27-30	2,258	1,653	2,045	1,567
31-40	3,307	2,499	3,005	2,276
41-50	965	747	936	746
50+	139	111	140	107
Religion and belief				
Christian	4,918	3,740	4,773	3,523
Muslim	925	665	969	742
No Religion	4,614	3,444	3,968	2,980
Other	246	184	310	243
Not Known	178	21	186	141

Completions are not directly comparable to starts. The completions shown in each year are not completions of the starts in the same year.

Age bands reflect those in use on the data collection forms at the time.

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from administrative IT systems. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate to that level.

OBP and SOTP Completions

	<u>2008/09</u>	<u>2009/10</u>
	OBP & SOTP completi ons	OBP & SOTP completi ons
All	8,438	8,648
Sex		
Female	414	392
Male	8,019	8,256
Not Known	5	0
Race		
Asian or Asian British	1,054	396
Black or Black British	401	1,104
Mixed	313	331
Chinese or Other	37	27
White	6,603	6,765
Not Known	30	25
No Record	0	0
Age		
Under 18	75	39
18-21	1,362	1,208
22-26	1,700	2,176
27-30	1,064	1,293
31-40	1,767	1,922
41-50	1,214	1,220
50+	707	790
Not Known	549	0
Religion and belief		
Christian	4,420	4,149
Muslim	901	895
No Religion	2,674	3,174
Other	435	415
Not Known	8	15

Offender behavioural and sex offender programme completions are combined for each year shown.

Excludes Therapeutic communities course

Age bands reflect those in use on the data collection forms at the time.

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from administrative IT systems. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate to that level.

Accredited Offender Behavioural programmes in the community and those that met the OGRS eligibility criteria

	2008/09		2009/10	
	Accredited programmes that met the criteria	Total accredited programmes	Accredited programmes that met the criteria	Total accredited programmes
All	13,613	16,166	15,622	17,543
Sex				
Female	1,051	1,441	1,593	1,870
Male	12,553	14,716	14,014	15,673
Not Known	9	9	15	0
Race				
Asian or Asian British	472	611	624	720
Black or Black British	847	1,119	955	1,104
Mixed	388	441	448	502
Chinese or Other	73	81	98	116
White	10,662	12,495	12,240	13,684
Not Known	1,171	1,419	1,257	1,417
Age				
Under 18	19	26	17	19
18-20	3,132	3,449	3,103	3,339
21-24	3,172	3,615	3,348	3,722
25-29	2,768	3,219	3,184	3,538
30-34	1,741	2,116	2,046	2,316
35-39	1,318	1,656	1,532	1,787
40-49	1,223	1,672	1,729	2,033
50+	216	380	524	643
Not Known	24	33	139	146

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from administrative IT systems. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate too that level.

Orders or Licences Successfully Completed

	2008/09		2009/10	
	Orders and licences terminated	Successfully completed orders and licences	Orders and licences terminated	Successfully completed orders and licences
All	190,579	137,378	199,616	148,939
Sex				
Female	26,544	19,747	28,137	21,649
Male	164,035	117,631	171,479	127,290
Race				
Asian	8,736	6,777	9,466	7,478
Black	12,793	9,504	13,586	10,228
Mixed	5,122	3,467	5,749	4,027
Other	2,240	1,793	2,351	1,922
Unknown	4,186	3,332	4,235	3,411
White	157,502	112,505	164,229	121,873
Age				
Under 20	17,850	10,573	17,837	10,842
Over 20	172,729	126,805	181,779	138,097

2009/10 exclusion rules for terminated orders/licences and successful orders/licences have been used for both years shown

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from administrative IT systems. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate to that level.

Prisoners recorded as being an assailant in KPI serious assault incidents

Number of prisoner assailants

	2008/09	2009/10
Male and female	708	722
Under 18	96	110
18-20	158	198
21-24	161	150
25-29	133	116
30-39	116	95
40-49	38	44
50-59	5	7
60 and over	1	2

Male	678	704
Under 18	95	110
18-20	152	195
21-24	157	146
25-29	129	109
30-39	104	91
40-49	35	44
50-59	5	7
60 and over	1	2

Female	30	18
Under 18	1	0
18-20	6	3
21-24	4	4
25-29	4	7
30-39	12	4
40-49	3	0
50-59	0	0
60 and over	0	0

	2008/09	2009/10
Male and female	708	722
Asian or Asian British	43	46
Black or Black British	206	205
Mixed	47	58
White	400	400
Chinese or Other	5	7
Not Stated	1	2
Not Known	6	4

Male	678	704
Asian or Asian British	42	43
Black or Black British	203	204
Mixed	46	57
White	377	392
Chinese or Other	5	5
Not Stated	1	0
Not Known	4	3
Female	30	18
Asian or Asian British	1	3
Black or Black British	3	1
Mixed	1	1
White	23	8
Chinese or Other	0	2
Not Stated	0	2
Not Known	2	1

* Mixed category was introduced in 2003/04 and is not applicable before then.

(1) A new Key Performance Indicator for serious assaults was introduced in 2003/04 and as a result reporting of all assault incidents improved. Reported incidents before 2005 are therefore not directly comparable with later figures. In particular, although figures for 2000/01 to 2003/04 have been included they are under reported by modern standards. It is now expected that all assaults, including fights, should be reported whether or not there was an injury. As this was not the case in the past care needs to be taken when interpreting changes over the years.

Prisoners recorded as being a victim in KPI serious assault incidents

Number of prisoner victims

	2008/09	2009/10
Male and female	881	794
Under 18	72	78
18-20	164	173
21-24	175	137
25-29	159	149
30-39	219	159
40-49	76	75
50-59	10	19
60 and over	6	4

Male	861	780
Under 18	71	77
18-20	162	173
21-24	168	134
25-29	156	143
30-39	213	155
40-49	75	75
50-59	10	19
60 and over	6	4

Female	20	14
Under 18	1	1
18-20	2	0
21-24	7	3
25-29	3	6
30-39	6	4
40-49	1	0
50-59	0	0
60 and over	0	0

2008/09 2009/10

Male and female	881	794
Asian or Asian British	79	65
Black or Black British	144	93
Mixed	36	42
White	611	572
Chinese or Other	7	17
Not Stated	4	1
Not Known	0	4

Male	861	780
Asian or Asian British	79	65
Black or Black British	142	93
Mixed	34	42
White	595	558
Chinese or Other	7	17
Not Stated	4	1
Not Known	0	4
Female	20	14
Asian or Asian British	0	0
Black or Black British	2	0
Mixed	2	0
White	16	14
Chinese or Other	0	0
Not Stated	0	0
Not Known	0	0

* Mixed category was introduced in 2003/04 and is not applicable before then.

(1) A new Key Performance Indicator for serious assaults was introduced in 2003/04 and as a result reporting of all assault incidents improved. Reported incidents before 2005 are therefore not directly comparable with later figures. In particular, although figures for 2000/01 to 2003/04 have been included they are under reported by modern standards. It is now expected that all assaults, including fights, should be reported whether or not there was an injury. As this was not the case in the past care needs to be taken when interpreting changes over the years.

(2) Assault incidents may involve a range of offences typically ABH, GBH and affray. The numbers in this table refer to those KPI serious assault incidents where there is a clear victim and assailant. They do not include fights where there may be no clear victim or assailant

(3) The NOMS incident reporting system only records the details of prisoners known to have been involved in a particular incident. Some incidents involve unknown assailants and will therefore have no numbers recorded. Other incidents may have more than one assailant or victim.

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from administrative IT systems. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate to that level.

Annex D - Contents

Sheet	Table
1	Adjudications
2	Complaints
3	Home Detention Curfew
4	Incentives and Earned Privileges
5	Re-categorisation
6	Release on Temporary Licence
7	Segregation
8	Use of Force

Table 1

Adjudications

	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Jul-09	Aug-09	Sep-09	Oct-09	Nov-09	Dec-09	Jan-10	Feb-10	Mar-10	Year End Total
Adjudications Dismissed													
All prisoners	1,856	1,741	1,651	1,918	1,765	1,686	1,832	1,649	1,590	1,583	1,614	1,740	20,625
Asian or Asian British	98	97	83	103	77	85	98	104	88	75	82	104	1,094
Black or Black British	286	297	281	300	297	272	307	281	291	275	259	283	3,429
Mixed	72	72	66	87	59	88	87	75	53	52	72	71	854
Chinese or Other	9	16	13	15	16	17	22	16	24	18	14	18	198
White	1,389	1,252	1,206	1,403	1,315	1,218	1,315	1,171	1,128	1,156	1,185	1,253	14,991
Not Stated	2	7	2	10	1	6	3	2	6	7	2	11	59
Adjudications Proven													
All prisoners	8,249	7,493	7,660	7,631	7,261	7,291	7,622	6,954	6,675	6,675	6,130	7,524	87,165
Asian or Asian British	384	373	410	378	362	357	336	331	347	341	270	400	4,289
Black or Black British	1,204	1,187	1,229	1,142	1,154	1,182	1,270	1,169	1,047	1,142	950	1,198	13,874
Mixed	392	349	313	336	268	327	315	327	321	295	263	298	3,804
Chinese or Other	32	45	41	56	57	26	43	38	43	36	34	48	499
White	6,230	5,537	5,651	5,709	5,413	5,371	5,644	5,067	4,899	4,841	4,593	5,542	64,497
Not Stated	7	2	16	10	7	28	14	22	18	20	20	38	202
Adjudications Referred													
All prisoners	2,092	2,369	2,461	2,409	2,307	2,192	2,193	2,094	1,968	1,760	1,959	1,948	25,752
Asian or Asian British	126	112	128	121	133	100	115	94	84	67	99	120	1,299
Black or Black British	426	386	431	297	381	302	368	342	337	351	346	335	4,302
Mixed	92	85	78	82	71	63	81	75	48	64	76	113	928
Chinese or Other	7	13	8	11	38	18	9	12	24	19	11	8	178
White	1,439	1,768	1,816	1,895	1,682	1,698	1,614	1,570	1,472	1,247	1,419	1,371	18,991
Not Stated	2	5	0	3	2	11	6	1	3	12	8	1	54

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from the locally managed SMART II system. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate to that level.

Definitions

Adjudications dismissed: An actual count of those charges dismissed or not proceeded with at a Governor's adjudication for the month across each of the ethnic bands.

Adjudications proven: An actual count of those adjudications which are proven disciplinary charges at a Governor's adjudication for the month across each of the ethnic bands.

Adjudications referred: An actual count of those adjudications which are referred to the independent adjudicator for the month across each of the ethnic bands.

Table 2

Complaints

	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Jul-09	Aug-09	Sep-09	Oct-09	Nov-09	Dec-09	Jan-10	Feb-10	Mar-10	Year End Total
All prisoners	20,100	19,058	21,243	21,790	20,380	21,646	21,396	21,447	21,086	19,820	19,713	22,660	250,339
Asian or Asian British	1,305	1,232	1,331	1,449	1,421	1,484	1,463	1,487	1,432	1,345	1,298	1,513	16,760
Black or Black British	3,350	3,163	3,474	3,530	3,214	3,496	3,390	3,454	3,384	3,255	3,025	3,469	40,204
Mixed	743	673	780	834	789	800	777	773	895	829	785	845	9,523
Chinese or Other	159	118	155	148	137	162	167	138	193	165	118	145	1,805
White	14,366	13,718	15,316	15,593	14,619	15,550	15,394	15,391	14,986	14,055	14,265	16,454	179,707
Not Stated	177	154	187	236	200	154	205	204	196	171	222	234	2,340

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from the locally managed SMART II system. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate to that level.

Definition

Complaints: An actual count of the number of initial formal complaints (Stage 1) received in the month across each of the ethnic bands. This figure does not include Racist Incident Reporting Forms.

Table 3

Home Detention Curfew

	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Jul-09	Aug-09	Sep-09	Oct-09	Nov-09	Dec-09	Jan-10	Feb-10	Mar-10	Year End Total
Eligible Applications													
All prisoners	3,027	2,774	2,790	3,246	2,909	3,037	3,104	2,759	2,617	2,802	2,796	3,427	35,288
Asian or Asian British	211	183	182	227	195	210	232	204	224	226	205	257	2,556
Black or Black British	278	262	252	290	281	313	297	258	263	244	240	290	3,268
Mixed	84	62	64	68	82	75	63	66	82	62	91	94	893
Chinese or Other	16	24	24	27	34	36	34	34	31	35	44	43	382
White	2,435	2,240	2,266	2,634	2,317	2,395	2,473	2,189	2,015	2,228	2,210	2,738	28,140
Not Stated	3	3	2	0	0	8	5	8	2	7	6	5	49
Total Released													
All prisoners	929	925	943	920	934	964	924	873	919	787	728	994	10,840
Asian or Asian British	94	82	82	100	77	81	63	86	93	70	55	94	977
Black or Black British	83	79	83	85	70	79	72	78	75	75	63	77	919
Mixed	27	29	20	19	27	30	30	32	26	21	18	22	301
Chinese or Other	3	11	4	3	2	7	4	11	4	4	6	8	67
White	721	724	754	713	758	766	754	664	721	616	586	793	8,570
Not Stated	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	6

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from the locally managed SMART II system. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate to that level.

Definition

Home detention curfew: The total number of eligible applications received and total number of prisoners released each month across each of the ethnic bands.

Table 4

Incentives and Earned Privileges

	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Jul-09	Aug-09	Sep-09	Oct-09	Nov-09	Dec-09	Jan-10	Feb-10	Mar-10	Year End Average
Basic Regime													
All prisoners	1,303	1,268	1,311	1,279	1,265	1,179	1,223	1,259	1,115	1,276	1,212	1,226	1,243
Asian or Asian British	93	102	97	89	82	70	76	91	65	81	73	76	83
Black or Black British	257	256	272	247	254	235	248	249	252	252	235	238	250
Mixed	74	91	79	67	80	76	72	71	61	71	70	65	73
Chinese or Other	12	15	8	6	15	12	10	11	18	7	6	7	11
White	866	802	854	868	831	786	816	829	710	857	819	831	822
Not Stated	1	2	1	2	3	0	1	8	9	8	9	9	4
Standard Regime													
All prisoners	46,859	46,484	46,337	47,242	47,154	46,476	46,977	46,605	45,065	45,545	45,377	46,663	46,399
Asian or Asian British	3,314	3,316	3,262	3,281	3,287	3,277	3,425	3,351	3,204	3,228	3,142	3,204	3,274
Black or Black British	6,786	6,728	6,777	6,682	6,684	6,744	6,630	6,556	6,408	6,450	6,384	6,499	6,611
Mixed	1,687	1,636	1,715	1,719	1,695	1,645	1,714	1,681	1,687	1,689	1,678	1,721	1,689
Chinese or Other	785	799	871	797	786	824	841	802	736	783	756	756	795
White	34,192	33,916	33,561	34,586	34,510	33,558	34,020	33,913	32,637	32,867	32,770	33,855	33,699
Not Stated	95	89	151	177	192	428	347	302	393	528	647	628	331
Enhanced Regime													
All prisoners	32,956	33,506	34,201	33,924	34,281	35,327	34,666	35,113	34,702	34,438	35,322	35,372	34,484
Asian or Asian British	2,352	2,430	2,490	2,524	2,537	2,605	2,498	2,544	2,529	2,525	2,594	2,585	2,518
Black or Black British	4,782	4,838	4,810	4,881	4,854	4,871	4,832	4,928	4,863	4,809	4,858	4,949	4,856
Mixed	1,018	1,023	1,012	1,033	1,062	1,122	1,095	1,131	1,125	1,094	1,120	1,150	1,082
Chinese or Other	466	494	509	536	541	506	505	562	515	478	486	478	506
White	24,261	24,644	25,289	24,864	25,198	26,099	25,619	25,833	25,558	25,370	26,088	26,005	25,402
Not Stated	77	77	91	86	89	124	117	115	112	162	176	205	119

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from the locally managed SMART II system. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate to that level.

Definition

Incentives and earned privileges: A single snapshot of the number of prisoners on each level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme at the end of the month across each of the ethnic bands. The sum of prisoners on the three levels is not the same as the total prison population figure in annex B, because these figures are derived from differently-timed snapshots from different sources.

Table 5

Re-categorisation

	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Jul-09	Aug-09	Sep-09	Oct-09	Nov-09	Dec-09	Jan-10	Feb-10	Mar-10	Year End Total
Re-categorisation Up													
All prisoners	306	253	296	334	269	261	282	258	345	228	207	176	3,215
Asian or Asian British	26	22	23	24	23	21	20	16	28	7	9	13	232
Black or Black British	27	22	37	43	29	30	37	50	55	26	24	34	414
Mixed	8	9	2	13	10	6	10	11	12	12	3	6	102
Chinese or Other	8	5	5	0	1	1	1	1	3	0	1	1	27
White	234	195	210	250	206	200	214	175	247	180	170	121	2,402
Not Stated	3	0	19	4	0	3	0	5	0	3	0	1	38
Re-categorisation Down													
All prisoners	621	699	767	714	616	608	609	609	570	599	743	690	7,845
Asian or Asian British	48	59	69	55	43	67	39	43	48	57	54	63	645
Black or Black British	109	102	98	90	73	100	105	76	81	72	91	101	1,098
Mixed	25	27	16	23	25	20	18	17	19	17	20	18	245
Chinese or Other	5	10	6	4	3	11	7	8	3	2	8	4	71
White	432	501	576	542	471	409	440	465	418	450	569	504	5,777
Not Stated	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	9

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from the locally managed SMART II system. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate to that level.

Definitions

Re-categorisation up: The total number of prisoners re-categorised up. This includes decisions to alter a prisoner between 'suitable for closed conditions' and 'suitable for open conditions'. Initial categorisation after sentencing and decisions to upgrade from Cat B to Cat A are not included.

Re-categorisation down: The total number of prisoners re-categorised down across each of the ethnic bands. This includes decisions to alter a prisoner between 'suitable for closed conditions' and 'suitable for open conditions'. Initial categorisation after sentencing and decisions to downgrade from Cat A to Cat B are not included.

Table 6

Release on Temporary Licence

	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Jul-09	Aug-09	Sep-09	Oct-09	Nov-09	Dec-09	Jan-10	Feb-10	Mar-10	Year End Total
All prisoners	32,205	33,169	34,944	35,154	34,565	36,991	33,239	32,975	34,828	28,953	29,516	31,304	397,843
Asian or Asian British	3,308	3,114	3,363	3,489	3,368	3,664	3,343	3,225	3,499	2,622	2,818	2,905	38,718
Black or Black British	3,964	4,171	4,412	4,288	4,285	4,270	4,161	3,658	4,254	3,359	3,554	3,615	47,991
Mixed	1,120	1,123	1,127	1,186	1,171	1,121	1,208	1,134	1,139	724	825	854	12,732
Chinese or Other	191	213	252	265	233	458	324	276	247	197	190	189	3,035
White	23,580	24,517	25,761	25,893	25,457	27,418	24,184	24,638	25,672	22,029	22,107	23,733	294,989
Not Stated	42	31	29	33	51	60	19	44	17	22	22	8	378

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from the locally managed SMART II system. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate to that level.

Definitions

Release on temporary license: An actual count of the number of approved days for the month across each of the ethnic bands.

Table 7

Segregation

	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Jul-09	Aug-09	Sep-09	Oct-09	Nov-09	Dec-09	Jan-10	Feb-10	Mar-10	Year End Total
Cellular Confinement													
All prisoners	3,684	3,938	3,959	4,541	4,124	4,497	4,375	3,725	3,785	4,407	3,751	4,332	49,118
Asian or Asian British	178	277	307	219	215	264	273	201	231	205	166	286	2,822
Black or Black British	693	843	653	816	861	1,016	818	790	695	962	652	894	9,693
Mixed	157	160	155	118	124	154	203	126	237	151	201	100	1,886
Chinese or Other	26	11	28	18	32	21	37	37	40	18	8	34	310
White	2,619	2,646	2,794	3,347	2,892	3,033	3,038	2,552	2,570	3,056	2,712	3,018	34,277
Not Stated	11	1	22	23	0	9	6	19	12	15	12	0	130
Good Order or Discipline													
All prisoners	5,034	5,012	4,925	5,477	5,079	5,406	5,580	5,356	5,079	5,493	5,182	5,575	63,198
Asian or Asian British	526	487	390	323	360	396	349	470	540	290	225	310	4,666
Black or Black British	1,083	1,140	1,179	992	921	986	1,169	1,088	1,128	1,254	1,223	1,176	13,339
Mixed	246	211	191	225	176	114	137	132	132	143	236	349	2,292
Chinese or Other	35	61	25	55	30	69	103	69	69	44	58	32	650
White	3,142	3,113	3,138	3,879	3,586	3,835	3,822	3,593	3,206	3,730	3,408	3,667	42,119
Not Stated	2	0	2	3	6	6	0	4	4	32	32	41	132
Own Protection													
All prisoners	2,505	2,545	2,478	2,326	2,455	2,261	2,479	2,440	1,905	2,032	2,043	2,049	27,518
Asian or Asian British	119	72	56	120	163	136	182	188	159	132	120	107	1,554
Black or Black British	265	202	282	254	295	193	175	263	156	264	258	233	2,840
Mixed	113	141	109	129	122	121	121	161	139	133	91	62	1,442
Chinese or Other	2	3	2	2	16	1	1	13	6	2	3	3	54
White	2,005	2,120	2,029	1,819	1,858	1,810	1,995	1,815	1,442	1,501	1,571	1,644	21,609
Not Stated	1	7	0	2	1	0	5	0	3	0	0	0	19
Awaiting Adjudication													
All prisoners	1,479	1,381	1,443	1,584	1,371	1,435	1,563	1,393	1,357	1,473	1,348	1,472	17,299
Asian or Asian British	78	71	78	76	84	64	75	87	66	101	69	85	934
Black or Black British	311	251	224	261	232	220	309	255	260	300	249	287	3,159
Mixed	75	50	60	61	54	66	51	56	57	61	56	68	715
Chinese or Other	15	12	13	6	12	16	18	6	9	9	15	11	142
White	998	991	1,068	1,179	979	1,059	1,110	985	960	988	959	1,021	12,297
Not Stated	2	6	0	1	10	10	0	4	5	14	0	0	52

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from the locally managed SMART II system. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate to that level.

Definitions

Segregations cellular confinement: An actual count of days, taking place at first unlock, of Cellular Confinement across each of the ethnic bands.

Segregations good order or discipline: An actual count of days of Good Order or Discipline (G.O.o.D) taking place at first unlock across each of the ethnic bands.

Segregations own protection: An actual count of days of Own Protection taking place at first unlock across each of the ethnic bands.

Segregations awaiting adjudication: An actual count of days, taking place at first unlock, of Prison Rule 53(4) / YOI Rule 58(4) i.e. Awaiting Adjudication.

Table 8

Use of Force

	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Jul-09	Aug-09	Sep-09	Oct-09	Nov-09	Dec-09	Jan-10	Feb-10	Mar-10	Year End Total
All prisoners	1,723	1,841	1,819	1,820	1,821	1,735	1,825	1,702	1,555	1,625	1,513	1,646	20,625
Asian or Asian British	91	105	104	89	102	105	88	97	76	94	72	84	1,107
Black or Black British	419	460	434	427	433	417	437	397	369	419	366	438	5,016
Mixed	82	99	90	89	89	87	89	103	83	91	68	80	1,050
Chinese or Other	16	24	35	19	25	15	21	18	9	9	19	8	218
White	1,111	1,146	1,156	1,185	1,168	1,098	1,186	1,086	1,016	1,006	985	1,033	13,176
Not Stated	4	7	0	11	4	13	4	1	2	6	3	3	58

Data Sources and Quality

These figures have been drawn from the locally managed SMART II system. Care is taken when processing and analysing returns but the detail is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. Although shown to the individual they may not be accurate to that level.

Definitions

Use of Force: An actual count of the total number of times Use of Force has taken place over the month for each ethnic band.