



Ministry  
of Justice

# **Annual Prison Performance Ratings Guide 2018/19**

Ministry of Justice  
Official Statistics Bulletin

25 July 2019

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Prison Performance Tool</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Prison Scores</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Moderation</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Weights</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Rules</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Inclusion in the Prison Performance Tool</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Prison Functions</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Comparator Groups</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Worked Examples</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Annex A – Performance Measure Information</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Annex B – Performance Measure Rating Definitions</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Annex C – Measure Weightings</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Annex D – 2018/19 Prison Comparator Groups</b>	<b>27</b>

# Guide to Annual Prison Performance Ratings

## Introduction

Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) is an executive agency of the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) with the goal of helping prison and probation services work together to manage offenders through their sentences. For 2018/19 HMPPS had responsibility for delivering prison performance using a suite of performance measures resulting in performance ratings for both public sector and privately managed prisons across England and Wales.

The Annual Prison Performance Ratings are derived from the Prison Performance Tool (PPT) which was introduced in April 2018 for the 2018/19 reporting year, replacing the Custodial Performance Tool used in 2017/18. All prison performance ratings reflect performance between 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2019.

There is overlap between some information provided in the Annual Prison Performance Ratings and other MoJ publications:

- The Safety in Custody National Statistics published quarterly by MoJ. Previous and current publications can be found at [www.gov.uk/government/collections/safety-in-custody-statistics](http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/safety-in-custody-statistics).
- The HMPPS Annual Digest Official Statistics is published annually by MoJ. Previous and current publications can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/prison-and-probation-trusts-performance-statistics>.

Data presented in this report have been drawn from administrative IT systems. Although care is taken when processing and analysing the data, the level of detail collected is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large-scale recording system.

Further information regarding data quality of individual performance measures used to determine overall prison performance can be found in the accompanying supplementary tables to this Guide.

## Prison Performance Tool

The prison performance framework was revised for 2018/19 reflecting changes to the responsibility of assessing prison performance from April 2018. Responsibility for monitoring performance at prison level was transferred to HMPPS having been commissioned by MoJ in 2017/18.

Prison level performance is monitored and measured using the Prison Performance Tool (PPT). The PPT uses a data-driven assessment of performance in each prison to derive overall prison performance ratings. As in previous years, data-driven ratings were ratified and subject to in depth scrutiny at the moderation process which took place in June 2019.

In the PPT, overall performance in each prison is rated on a 1 to 4 scale. The different ratings are 4: Performance is exceptional; 3: Performance is acceptable; 2: Performance is of concern and 1: Performance is of serious concern. Note, this is a slight change from the rating definitions used in the Custodial Performance Tool in 2017/18.

In 2018/19, the PPT used 26 performance measures and three sub measures, split into six domains which aim to reflect the HMPPS priorities:

- Safety;
- Security;
- Respect;
- Rehabilitation and Release Planning;
- Purposeful Activity;
- Organisational Effectiveness.

Work was undertaken jointly between MoJ and HMPPS to develop the 2018/19 prison performance framework and align the performance measures to an appropriate domain, and where appropriate linking to the expectations set by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP). The performance measures by domain are as follows:

<b>PPT Domain</b>	<b>Performance Measure</b>
Safety	Positive Random Mandatory drug testing including new psychoactive substances
	Months drug testing levels not met (sub measure)
	Risk Management Audit
	Measuring the Quality of Prison Life - safety
	Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners
	Assaults on staff incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners
	Control and Restraint training/Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint training*
	Tornado commitment
	Self-harm incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – safety
Security	Number of escapes from prison or prisoner escort
	Abscends from open prison conditions – rate per 100,000 prisoner days
	Security Audit
Respect	Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – decency
	Audit of Living Conditions
	Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – BME simplified
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – respect
Purposeful Activity	Hours worked by prisoners in industry
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – purposeful activity
Rehabilitation and Release Planning	Accredited programme completions
	Release on Temporary Licence – % successful releases
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – rehabilitation and release planning
	Incident Reporting System – data quality audit

<b>PPT Domain</b>	<b>Performance Measure</b>
Organisational Effectiveness	Incident Reporting System – assaults checks (sub measure)
	Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks (sub measure)
	Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)
	Foreign National Offender Referrals
	Prison Operating within Budget
	Staff sickness absence

\* Male Young Offender Institution - Young People prisons undertake Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint training. All other prisons undertake Control and Restraint training

Descriptions of each performance measure along with the data source and target can be found in [Annex A](#). Information on rating definitions for each performance measure can be found in [Annex B](#).

## Prison Scores

Overall prison performance ratings are derived from a data-driven score for each prison. Each measure in the performance framework carries a weighting, with the sum of all measure weights adding up to 100% for each prison. The weightings represent the importance of the performance measure for HMPPS. Measures are weighted differently for different prison functions, based on their relative importance.

Each measure carries a rating for each prison; most are rated on a 1 to 4 scale, while some measures only allow ratings of 1 to 3 and others are binary. As such, the maximum possible score a prison can achieve on the PPT varies depending on which measures apply to the prison and the specific distribution of weights. To overcome this, the overall prison ratings are assigned using the score the prison achieved as a percentage of the maximum possible score achievable.

There are also differences in the way measure ratings are calculated. Some compare performance to target, some are set nationally to reflect consistent expectations across the estate, whereas others are specific to each prison considering a range of local factors. For audit and HM Inspectorate of Prisons measures, the measure rating corresponds directly to the audit or inspection outcome. Not all performance measures in the framework apply to every prison as a result of varying prison functions.

The overall prison score is calculated by the sum of each individual measure weight multiplied by the individual measure rating.

The thresholds for the Annual Prison Performance Ratings 2018/19 are:

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Percentage of max score</b>
4: Performance is exceptional	Greater than or equal to 82%
3: Performance is acceptable	Less than 82% <b>And</b> Greater than or equal to 61%
2: Performance is of concern	Less than 61% <b>And</b> Greater than or equal to 51%
1: Performance is of serious concern	Less than 51%

## Moderation

Prior to publication of Annual Prison Performance Ratings, an annual moderation process is undertaken by HMPPS. During this process performance data is scrutinised by key stakeholders in the prison performance process and considered alongside wider contextual evidence to make a final assessment for the year-end rating of each prison. This ensures the rating for each prison is fully reflective of performance.

In 2018/19, prisons could voluntarily enter the process, or were automatically referred if one or more of the following criteria was met:

- One or more escape from the prison or prisoner escort;
- Two or more poor HM Inspectorate of Prisons healthy prison test outcomes from an inspection;
- Urgent Notification invoked;
- Failure of the Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit) performance measure;
- Low volumes of one or more of the following measures which then impacts the overall rating of the prison:
  - Positive Random Mandatory drug testing including new psychoactive substances;
  - Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents;
  - Assaults on staff incidents;
  - Self-harm incidents.

A moderation panel discussed each proposal to agree a final rating. The panel consisted of representatives from across HMPPS and MoJ to ensure an independent approach was maintained.

## Weights

Weights used in the PPT are separated into three overall distributions to reflect the main prison functions: male closed prisons; women's prisons; and male open prisons. The agreed weightings for each distribution can be seen in [Annex C](#).

### Weight redistribution

Where a measure doesn't apply to a prison, the weighting for that measure is redistributed to all other measures across the PPT. This is done proportionately to ensure the weight distribution sums to 100% for all prisons.

Inspections, audits and surveys used in the PPT are not always carried out on annual basis, and as such these measures are age weighted on the assumption that the results become less relevant over time. The weightings for each of these measures reduce in weight over time as follows:

Age	Weighting reduces by:
Up to 1 year	0%
1 to 2 years	20%
2 to 3 years	40%
3 to 4 years	60%
Over 4 years	80%

In these cases, the weighting which no longer applies to the measure is proportionately redistributed across all other measures in the framework. As such, the measures reduced in weight will regain some of this released weight.

## Rules

A number of rules exist in the PPT for certain measures.

### Drug testing levels

Prisons are required to undertake a minimum number of drug tests each month. Failure to do this affects the maximum achievable performance for the Positive Random Mandatory drug testing including new psychoactive substances performance measure.

If a prison misses the minimum number of mandatory tests in five or fewer months of the year, the maximum rating they can achieve for Positive Random Mandatory drug testing including new psychoactive substances is **3**.

If they miss for six or more months, the rating for Positive Random Mandatory drug testing including new psychoactive substances will **reduce by 1 rating**.

### Incident Reporting System – assaults checks

This is a subset of records reviewed as part of the Incident Reporting System Audit, looking specifically at assaults incidents. If a prison does not meet the target of 85% of assaults incidents correctly recorded, the maximum rating they can achieve for both the prisoner on prison assaults rate and assaults on staff rate performance measure is a **2**.

## **Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks**

This is a subset of records reviewed as part of the Incident Reporting System Audit, looking specifically at self-harm incidents. If a prison does not meet the target of 85% of self-harm incidents correctly recorded, the maximum rating they can achieve for the self-harm rate performance measure is a **2**.

## **Escapes from prison or prisoner escort**

If a prison had an escape from prison or prisoner escort during 2018/19, they were automatically considered at the moderation process for the overall performance rating to be adjusted down.

## **HM Inspectorate of Prisons**

If a prison has an inspection during 2018/19 and has two or more poor outcomes in the four healthy prison test areas, they were automatically considered at the moderation process to further scrutinise whether the data-driven overall rating accurately reflected performance.

A similar approach was taken for prisons receiving an Urgent Notification 2018/19.

## **Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)**

Any prison failing this audit during 2018/19 was automatically considered during the moderation process to discuss whether the data driven overall rating should be adjusted down as a result of demonstrating unreliability of data.

## **Inclusion in the Prison Performance Tool**

In 2018/19, 118 prisons were included in the PPT comprising of 95 male closed prisons, 14 male open prisons and 10 women's prisons. For a prison to be included in the PPT, they need to meet the following criteria:

- have received an HM Inspectorate of Prisons inspection;
- have received internal audits carried out by HMPPS Operational System & Assurance Group;
- have maintained consistent performance for six months;
- have stable Operational Capacity levels.

As a result, HMP Berwyn were **not** included in the PPT in 2018/19 and do not feature in the Annual Prison Performance Ratings 2018/19. They will be included in the 2019/20 PPT and Annual Prison Performance Ratings 2019/20.

HMP The Verne will not be included in the PPT in 2019/20 due to not meeting the above criteria.

## Prison Functions

Prisons are classified by their predominant prison function. A number of prisons are multi-functional and hold a range of types of prisoner. In these cases, the predominant function has been reported in the Annual Prison Performance Ratings 2018/19.

<b>Prison Function</b>	<b>Description</b>
Male Dispersal	Hold male prisoners classified as category A; prisoners whose escape would be highly dangerous to the public or the police or the security of the State and for whom the aim must be to make escape impossible.
Male Category B	Hold male prisoners classified as category B; prisoners for whom the very highest conditions of security are not necessary but for whom escape must be made very difficult.
Male Category C	Hold male prisoners classified as category C; prisoners who cannot be trusted in open conditions but who do not have the resources and will to make a determined escape attempt.
Male Open	Accommodate male category D prisoners whose risk of absconding is considered to be low or who are of low risk to the public because of the way they have addressed their offending behaviour. Open prisons also house indeterminate and longer-sentenced prisoners who are coming towards the end of their sentence and who have gradually worked their way down the categories.
Male Local	Hold male prisoners. These serve the courts and receive remand and post-conviction prisoners, before their allocation to other establishments. They hold many short-term prisoners; remand prisoners; those waiting allocation to training prisons; and may hold a small number of immigration detainees. The short-term prisoners held in local prisons are those who are due for release in to the surrounding area and as such engage with resettlement providers in the last three months of their sentence.
Female Closed	Hold female prisoners for whom the very highest conditions of security are not necessary but who present too high a risk for open conditions or for whom open conditions are not appropriate.
Female Open	Similar to Male Open, but holding female prisoners.
Female Local	Similar to Male Local, but holding female prisoners.
Male Closed Young Offender Institution	Male closed establishment holding young men aged 18 to 21.
Male Young Offender Institution - Young People	Hold male young people aged 15 to 17.

## Comparator Groups

The 2018/19 comparator groups of prisons can be found in [Annex D](#). A statistical methodology is used to calculate the comparator groups. A number of contextual variables are used to determine a statistical score for each prison. These include:

- Prison Type;
- Whether the prison holds young offenders;
- Prison Category;
- Gender of prisoners;
- Proportion of prisons who are sex offenders;
- Complexity of the prison to determine whether it is a standard site, complex or diverse and complex<sup>1</sup>;
- Operational capacity;
- Average age of the prisoners;
- Churn of prisoners<sup>2</sup>;
- Building age;
- Proportion of different category prisoners;
- Proportion of prisoners who are foreign national offenders.

The variables are weighted with the most important, as set by HMPPS, contributing more to the statistically derived score. Prisons with the nearest scores are set as the comparators with each prison having a maximum of eight within their group. A comparator group is unique to the prison. If Prison A has Prison B and C in its comparator group, this does not necessarily mean Prison B would have Prison A and C in its group.

The comparator group methodology will be reviewed during the 2019/20 year, to better reflect on-going structural changes to the estate.

---

<sup>1</sup> Prison complexity is a judgement based on prison population and churn rate, amount of staff, complexity of prisoner population and notoriety, location, site logistics, categorisation and risk, political scrutiny, media relations and management and financial commercial management.

<sup>2</sup> Churn of prisoners is the rate of new admissions or transfers in as a proportion of the prison population.

## Worked Examples

**Prison 1** is a male closed prison with all measures except absconds (not applicable to closed prisons). All audit and HMIP measures took place within 1 year.

Performance Measure	Weighting	Rating	Measure score
Positive random mandatory drug testing including new psychoactive substances	5.3%	4	0.212
Risk Management Audit	4.2%	1	0.042
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life - safety	3.2%	1	0.032
Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	4.2%	1	0.042
Assaults on staff incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	6.3%	3	0.189
Control and Restraint training	0.8%	1	0.008
Tornado commitment	0.8%	1	0.008
Self-harm incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	5.3%	3	0.159
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Safety	6.5%	2	0.13
Number of escapes from prison	0.0%	3	0
Absconds from open prison conditions – rate per 100,000 prisoner days	N/A	N/A	N/A
Security Audit	10.5%	1	0.105
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – decency	3.2%	2	0.064
Audit of Living Conditions	5.3%	2	0.106
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – BME simplified	4.2%	2	0.084
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Respect	6.5%	2	0.13
Hours worked by prisoners in industry	1.7%	4	0.068
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Purposeful Activity	6.5%	3	0.195
Accredited programmes completions	3.5%	2	0.07
Release on Temporary Licence – successes	1.7%	2	0.034
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Rehabilitation and Release Planning	6.5%	2	0.13
Incident Reporting System – Data Quality Audit	5.3%	3	0.159
Incident Reporting System – assaults checks	0.0%	3	0
Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks	0.0%	3	0
Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)	0.0%	4	0
Foreign National Offender Referrals	1.7%	3	0.051
Prison Operating within Budget	3.5%	2	0.07
Staff sickness absence	3.5%	4	0.14
<b>Total:</b>			<b>2.23</b>
			<b>57.9%</b>
			<b>2</b>

The measure score is the measure weighting multiplied by the measure rating.

The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 1 scored 2.23. The maximum score achievable is 3.85. This gives a percentage score of 57.9%, equivalent to an overall rating of 2

Prison percentage score      Overall prison rating

**Prison 2** is a women's prison. Some measures do not have data. All audits and HMIP measures took place within the last year.

Performance Measure	Weighting	Rating	Measure score
Positive random mandatory drug testing including new psychoactive substances	5.8%	3	0.17
Risk Management Audit	5.8%	1	0.06
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life - safety	3.5%	2	0.07
Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	4.7%	2	0.09
Assaults on staff incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	6.9%	4	0.28
Control and Restraint training	0.9%	1	0.01
Tornado commitment	0.9%	2	0.02
Self-harm incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	5.8%	2	0.12
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Safety	7.2%	3	0.22
Number of escapes from prison	0.0%	3	0.00
Absconds from open prison conditions – rate per 100,000 prisoner days	N/A	N/A	N/A
Security Audit	11.6%	2	0.23
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – decency	3.5%	3	0.11
Audit of Living Conditions	N/A	N/A	N/A
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – BME simplified	4.7%	2	0.09
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Respect	7.2%	4	0.29
Hours worked by prisoners in industry	1.8%	4	0.07
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Purposeful Activity	7.2%	2	0.14
Accredited programmes completions	N/A	N/A	N/A
Release on Temporary Licence – successes	1.8%	3	0.05
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Rehabilitation and Release Planning	7.2%	3	0.22
Incident Reporting System – Data Quality Audit	5.8%	2	0.12
Incident Reporting System – assaults checks	0.0%	3	0.00
Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks	0.0%	2	0.00
Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)	0.0%	1	0.00
Foreign National Offender Referrals	N/A	N/A	N/A
Prison Operating within Budget	3.9%	2	0.08
Staff sickness absence	3.9%	2	0.08
<b>Total:</b>			<b>2.51</b>

The measure score is the measure weighting multiplied by the measure rating.

Prison 2 does not have data for Audit of Living Conditions, Accredited Programme Completions or Foreign National Offender Referrals. The weight assigned to these measures is redistributed across all other measures with data.

The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 2 scored 2.51. The maximum score achievable is 3.88. This gives a percentage score of 64.6%, equivalent to an overall rating of 3.

Prison percentage score	64.6%
Overall prison rating	3

**Prison 3** is a male open prison with all applicable measures. The HMIP inspection took place 2.5 years ago.

Performance Measure	Weighting	Rating	Measure score
Positive random mandatory drug tests including new psychoactive substances	6.0%	3	0.18
Risk Management Audit	4.9%	4	0.20
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life - safety	3.5%	3	0.11
Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	4.0%	2	0.08
Assaults on staff incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	4.7%	3	0.14
Control and Restraint training	1.1%	4	0.05
Tornado commitment	0.0%	3	0.00
Self-harm incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	4.2%	4	0.17
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Safety	4.7%	4	0.19
Number of escapes from prison	N/A	N/A	N/A
Absconds from open prison conditions – rate per 100,000 prisoner days	6.5%	4	0.26
Security Audit	4.7%	3	0.14
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – decency	4.0%	3	0.12
Audit of Living Conditions	6.6%	3	0.20
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – BME simplified	4.9%	3	0.15
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Respect	4.7%	4	0.19
Hours worked by prisoners in industry	2.0%	3	0.06
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Purposeful Activity	5.4%	3	0.16
Accredited programmes completions	N/A	N/A	N/A
Release on Temporary Licence – successes	6.5%	4	0.26
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Rehabilitation and Release Planning	5.4%	4	0.22
Incident Reporting System – Data Quality Audit	6.0%	3	0.18
Incident Reporting System – assaults checks	0.0%	3	0.00
Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks	0.0%	3	0.00
Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)	0.0%	3	0.00
Foreign National Offender Referrals	2.0%	3	0.06
Prison Operating within Budget	4.1%	3	0.12
Staff sickness absence	4.1%	3	0.12
<b>Total:</b>			<b>3.34</b>
	<b>Prison percentage score</b>	<b>Overall prison rating</b>	
	87.6%	4	

The measure score is the measure weighting multiplied by the measure rating.

Prison 3 has all measures applicable to an open prison. As the HMIP is 2.5 years old, the four HMIP Healthy Prison Test measures have reduced in weighting by 40%. The freed weight is redistributed across all measures with data with the HMIP measures regaining some of this redistributed weight.

The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 3 scored 3.34. The maximum score achievable is 3.81. This gives a percentage score of 87.6%, equivalent to an overall rating of 4.

**Prison 4** is a male closed prison. Some measures do not apply and the Security Audit was undertaken 1.5 years ago.

Performance Measure	Weighting	Rating	Measure score
Positive random mandatory drug tests including new psychoactive substances	6.4%	1	0.06
Risk Management Audit	N/A	N/A	N/A
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life - safety	3.8%	2	0.08
Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	5.0%	1	0.05
Assaults on staff incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	7.6%	3	0.23
Control and Restraint training	1.0%	3	0.03
Tornado commitment	1.0%	2	0.02
Self-harm incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	6.4%	4	0.25
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Safety	7.8%	3	0.23
Number of escapes from prison	0.0%	3	0.00
Absconds from open prison conditions – rate per 100,000 prisoner days	N/A	N/A	N/A
Security Audit	10.1%	4	0.40
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – decency	3.8%	3	0.12
Audit of Living Conditions	N/A	N/A	N/A
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – BME simplified	5.0%	2	0.10
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Respect	7.8%	4	0.31
Hours worked by prisoners in industry	N/A	N/A	N/A
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Purposeful Activity	7.8%	2	0.16
Accredited programmes completions	N/A	N/A	N/A
Release on Temporary Licence – successes	2.0%	3	0.06
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Rehabilitation and Release Planning	7.8%	3	0.23
Incident Reporting System – Data Quality Audit	6.4%	3	0.19
Incident Reporting System – assaults checks	0.0%	2	0.00
Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks	0.0%	3	0.00
Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)	0.0%	4	0.00
Foreign National Offender Referrals	2.0%	2	0.04
Prison Operating within Budget	4.2%	3	0.13
Staff sickness absence	4.2%	1	0.04
<b>Total:</b>			<b>2.73</b>

  

<b>Prison percentage score</b>	<b>71.1%</b>
<b>Overall prison rating</b>	<b>3</b>

The measure score is the measure weighting multiplied by the measure rating.

Due to the age of the Security Audit, the weighting for this will reduce by 20%.  
The weighting freed from this and the measures without data is proportionately redistributed across all measures with data. As such the Security Audit regains some of this redistributed weight.

The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 4 scored 2.73. The maximum score achievable is 3.85. This gives a percentage score of 71.1%, equivalent to an overall rating of 3.

**Prison 5** is a women’s prison which didn’t meet target for IRS Assaults checks and IRS Self-Harm checks. It has data for all other measures and all audits and HMIPs are within the last year.

Performance Measure	Weighting	Rating	Measure score
Positive random mandatory drug tests including new psychoactive substances	5.1%	1	0.05
Risk Management Audit	5.1%	3	0.15
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life - safety	3.1%	3	0.09
Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	4.1%	2	0.08
Assaults on staff incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	6.1%	2	0.12
Control and Restraint training	0.8%	3	0.02
Tornado commitment	0.8%	3	0.02
Self-harm incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	5.1%	2	0.10
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Safety	6.3%	3	0.19
Number of escapes from prison	0.0%	3	0.00
Abscends from open prison conditions – rate per 100,000 prisoner days	N/A	N/A	N/A
Security Audit	10.2%	3	0.31
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – decency	3.1%	3	0.09
Audit of Living Conditions	5.6%	2	0.11
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – BME simplified	4.1%	2	0.08
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Respect	6.3%	2	0.13
Hours worked by prisoners in industry	1.6%	3	0.05
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Purposeful Activity	6.3%	2	0.13
Accredited programmes completions	4.9%	3	0.15
Release on Temporary Licence – successes	1.6%	2	0.03
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Rehabilitation and Release Planning	6.3%	3	0.19
Incident Reporting System – Data Quality Audit	5.1%	1	0.05
Incident Reporting System – assaults checks	0.0%	1	0.00
Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks	0.0%	1	0.00
Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)	0.0%	2	0.00
Foreign National Offender Referrals	1.6%	1	0.02
Prison Operating within Budget	3.4%	2	0.07
Staff sickness absence	3.4%	2	0.07
<b>Total:</b>			<b>2.30</b>
	<b>Prison percentage score</b>	<b>Overall prison rating</b>	
	<b>60.2%</b>	<b>2</b>	

The measure score is the measure weighting multiplied by the measure rating.

Prison 5 was rated 1 for the IRS Assaults check measure. The maximum rating achievable for Assaults on Staff and Prisoner on Prisoner Assaults was therefore a 2 regardless of performance compared to target.

Prison 5 was rated 1 for the IRS self-harm check measure. The maximum rating achievable Self-Harm Incidents was therefore a 2 regardless of performance compared to target.

The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 5 scored 2.30. The maximum score achievable is 3.83. This gives a percentage score of 60.2%, equivalent to an overall rating of 2.

## Annex A – Performance Measure Information

PPT Domain	Performance Measure <i>Description in italics</i>	Data source	Target	Ratings available
Safety	<b>Positive Random Mandatory drug testing including new psychoactive substances (including months drug testing levels were not met)</b> <i>The average rate of positive results from mandatory random drug testing.</i> <i>Further information can be found in the HMPPS Annual Digest.</i>	Security Group MDT database	Locally set	1 to 4
	<b>Months random drug testing levels not met</b> <i>The number of months in the year where the prison did not undertake the required number of random drug tests.</i>	Security Group MDT database	N/A – measure affects rating for above measure	1 to 3
	<b>Risk Management Audit</b> <i>An announced audit to determine how effectively the prison is assessing and managing risks of violence and self-harm.</i>	Operational and System Assurance Group	Amber-green (rating of 3)	1 to 4
	<b>Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – safety</b> <i>A survey of prisoners' perceptions of safety in the prison.</i>	Operational and System Assurance Group	Rating of 3	1 to 4
	<b>Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents</b> <i>Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents reported as a rate per 1,000 prisoners. An assault is defined as unwanted physical contact between two or more individuals.</i> <i>Further information can be found in the Safety in Custody National Statistics.</i>	Prison NOMIS	Locally set	1 to 4

<b>PPT Domain</b>	<b>Performance Measure <i>Description in italics</i></b>	<b>Data source</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Ratings available</b>
	<p><b>Assaults on staff incidents</b></p> <p><i>Assaults on staff reported as a rate per 1,000 prisoners. An assault is defined as unwanted physical contact between two or more individuals.</i></p> <p><i>Further information can be found in the Safety in Custody National Statistics.</i></p>	Prison NOMIS	Locally set	1 to 4
	<p><b>Control and Restraint training</b></p> <p><i>The percentage of operational staff who have attended 8 hours of initial or refresher training within the last 12 months.</i></p>	HMPPS Performance Hub	National: 80%	1 to 3
	<p><b>Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint training (Male Young Offender Institution - Young People prisons only)</b></p> <p><i>The percentage of eligible staff who have been trained in Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint techniques in the last six months.</i></p>	HMPPS Performance Hub	National: 80%	1 to 3
	<p><b>Tornado commitment</b></p> <p><i>The number of staff trained in advanced Control and Restraint techniques for Tornado purposes.</i></p>	HMPPS Performance Hub	Locally set	1 to 3
	<p><b>Self-harm incidents</b></p> <p><i>Self-harm incidents reported as a rate per 1,000 prisoners. Self-harm is defined as any act where a prisoner deliberately harms or injures themselves.</i></p> <p><i>Further information can be found in the Safety in Custody National Statistics.</i></p>	Prison NOMIS	Locally set	1 to 4
	<p><b>HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Safety</b></p> <p><i>Focusses on early days in custody, managing behaviour, security, safeguarding and leadership and management of safety.</i></p>	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons	Reasonably good (rating of 3)	1 to 4

<b>PPT Domain</b>	<b>Performance Measure <i>Description in italics</i></b>	<b>Data source</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Ratings available</b>
Security	<p><b>Number of escapes from prison or prisoner escort</b></p> <p><i>A prisoner escapes from a prison or prisoner escort if they unlawfully gain their liberty by breaching the secure perimeter of a closed prison, i.e. the outside wall or boundary of the prison.</i></p> <p><i>Further information can be found in the HMPPS Annual Digest.</i></p>	Prison NOMIS	N/A – managed through moderation	N/A
	<p><b>Absconds from open prison conditions</b></p> <p><i>Abscond incidents reported as a rate per 100,000 prisoner days. An abscond is an escape that does not involve overcoming a physical security. Only applies to open prisons.</i></p> <p><i>Further information can be found in the HMPPS Annual Digest.</i></p>	Prison NOMIS	Locally set	1 to 4
	<p><b>Security Audit</b></p> <p><i>To review levels of compliance within specific HM Prison Service Performance Standards.</i></p>	Operational and System Assurance Group	Moderate (rating of 3)	1 to 4
Respect	<p><b>Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – decency</b></p> <p><i>A survey of prisoners’ perceptions of decency in the prison.</i></p>	Operational and System Assurance Group	Rating of 3	1 to 4
	<p><b>Audit of Living Conditions</b></p> <p><i>To help drive improvements in living conditions in prisons. Residential units, cells, communal areas including serveries, toilets and showers are observed.</i></p>	Operational and System Assurance Group	Moderate (rating of 3)	1 to 4

<b>PPT Domain</b>	<b>Performance Measure <i>Description in italics</i></b>	<b>Data source</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Ratings available</b>
	<p><b>Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – BME simplified</b></p> <p><i>Whether any difference in survey results from white and BME prisoners is statistically significantly different (i.e. did not occur by chance).</i></p>	Operational and System Assurance Group	National: no statistically significant difference scores for White vs BME prisoners	2 to 3
	<p><b>HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Respect</b></p> <p><i>Focuses on staff-prisoner relationships, daily life, equality, diversity and faith, health, well-being and social care and leadership and management of respect.</i></p>	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons	Reasonably good (rating of 3)	1 to 4
Purposeful Activity	<p><b>Hours worked by prisoners in industry</b></p> <p><i>Hours worked by prisoners in industry as a percentage of scheduled hours. Industries include woodwork, textiles and working in call centres.</i></p> <p><i>Further information can be found in the HMPPS Annual Digest publication.</i></p>	Prison NOMIS	National – 80%	1 to 4
	<p><b>HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Purposeful Activity</b></p> <p><i>Focusses on time out of cell, education, skills and work activities and leadership and management of purposeful activity.</i></p>	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons	Reasonably good (rating of 3)	1 to 4
Rehabilitation and Release Planning	<p><b>Accredited programmes completions</b></p> <p><i>The number of completions of Offender Behaviour Programmes and Sex Offender Treatment Programmes.</i></p> <p><i>Further information can be found in the HMPPS Annual Digest.</i></p>	Prison NOMIS	Locally set	1 to 3

<b>PPT Domain</b>	<b>Performance Measure <i>Description in italics</i></b>	<b>Data source</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Ratings available</b>
	<p><b>Release on Temporary Licence – successes</b></p> <p><i>Percentage of prisoners who return from Release on Temporary Licence. Release on Temporary Licence allows eligible prisoners to be temporarily released for precisely defined activities that cannot be provided in prisons.</i></p>	Prison NOMIS	National: 95%	1 to 4
	<p><b>HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Rehabilitation and Release Planning</b></p> <p><i>Focusses on children and families and contact with the outside world, reducing risk, rehabilitation and progression, interventions, specialist units, release planning and leadership and management of rehabilitation and release planning.</i></p>	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons	Reasonably good (rating of 3)	1 to 4
Organisational Effectiveness	<p><b>Incident Reporting System – Data Quality Audit</b></p> <p><i>Audit ensuring reportable incidents are recorded on the Incident Reporting System package of Prison-NOMIS.</i></p>	Operational and System Assurance Group	Moderate (rating of 3)	1 to 4
	<p><b>Incident Reporting System – assaults checks</b></p> <p><i>Percentage of assaults incidents checked in the Incident Reporting System Data Quality Audit recorded on Prison-NOMIS.</i></p>	Operational and System Assurance Group	National: 85%	2 to 3
	<p><b>Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks</b></p> <p><i>Percentage of self-harm incidents checked in the Incident Reporting System Data Quality Audit recorded on Prison-NOMIS.</i></p>	Operational and System Assurance Group	National: 85%	2 to 3
	<p><b>Data Integrity (Governance &amp; Operational Audit)</b></p> <p><i>Review of financial and performance data processes.</i></p>	Government Internal Audit	Rating of 3	1 to 4

<b>PPT Domain</b>	<b>Performance Measure <i>Description in italics</i></b>	<b>Data source</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Ratings available</b>
	<b>Foreign National Offender Referrals</b> <i>Percentage of referrals to the Home Office made within 10 days.  Further information can be found in the HMPPS Annual Digest.</i>	Prison NOMIS	National: 90%	1 to 3
	<b>Prison Operating within Budget</b> <i>Expenditure as a proportion of the agreed annual budget.</i>	Single Operating Platform	Spend within annual budget	2 to 3
	<b>Staff sickness absence</b> <i>Average number of days lost to staff sickness per member of staff target.  Further information can be found in the HMPPS Annual Digest.</i>	Single Operating Platform for public sector prisons, HMPPS Performance Hub for privately managed prisons.	National: 9 days per member of staff	1 to 4

## Annex B – Performance Measure Rating Definitions

PPT Domain	Performance Measure	Measure Rating			
		1	2	3	4
Safety	Positive Random Mandatory Drug Testing including new psychoactive substances	Greater than 125% of target.	Greater than 100% and less than or equal to 125% of target.	Less than the target and greater than 75% of target.	Less than or equal to 75% of target.
	Months random drug testing levels not met	Missed required level for 6 or more months in 2018/19	Missed required level for 1 to 5 months in 2018/19	Met required level in all months	N/A
	Risk Management Audit	Audit rating of Red	Audit rating of Amber-Red	Audit rating of Amber-Green	Audit rating of Green
	Measuring the Quality of Prison Life - safety	Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
	Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	Greater than 125% of target.	Greater than 100% and less than or equal to 125% of target.	Less than the target and greater than 75% of target.	Less than or equal to 75% of target.
	Assaults on staff incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	Greater than 125% of target.	Greater than 100% and less than or equal to 125% of target.	Less than the target and greater than 75% of target.	Less than or equal to 75% of target.
	Control and Restraint training	Performance less than 76%	Performance between 76% and 79.9%	Performance greater or equal to 80%	N/A

PPT Domain	Performance Measure	Measure Rating			
		1	2	3	4
	Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint training	Performance less than 76%	Performance between 76% and 79.9%	Performance greater or equal to 80%	N/A
	Tornado commitment	Less than 90% of target	Greater than or equal to 90% of target	Greater than or equal to target	N/A
	Self-harm incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	Greater than 125% of target	Greater than 100% and less than or equal to 125% of target	Less than the target and greater than 75% of target.	Less than or equal to 75% of target
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Safety	Outcomes for prisoners are poor	Outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good	Outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good	Outcomes for prisoners are good
Security	Number of escapes from prison	1 escape or more	N/A	No escapes	N/A
	Absconds from open prison conditions – rate per 100,000 prisoner days	Less than 90% of target achieved	Missing target but 90% or more of target achieved	Target achieved	Target achieved and in the top 25% of prisons
	Security Audit	Audit rating of Unsatisfactory	Audit rating of Limited	Audit rating of Moderate	Audit rating of Substantial
Respect	Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – decency	Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
	Audit of Living Conditions	Audit rating of Unsatisfactory	Audit rating of Limited	Audit rating of Moderate	Audit rating of Substantial

PPT Domain	Performance Measure	Measure Rating			
		1	2	3	4
	Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – BME simplified	N/A	Outcomes statistically significantly different	Outcomes not statistically significantly different	N/A
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons - Respect	Outcomes for prisoners are poor	Outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good	Outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good	Outcomes for prisoners are good
Purposeful Activity	Hours worked by prisoners in industry	Less than 65% of scheduled hours	65% to less than 80% of scheduled hours	80% to 100% of scheduled hours	Greater than 100% of scheduled hours
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Purposeful Activity	Outcomes for prisoners are poor	Outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good	Outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good	Outcomes for prisoners are good
Rehabilitation and Release Planning	Accredited programmes completions	Less than 80% of target achieved	Missing target but 80% or greater than target achieved	Target achieved	N/A
	Release on Temporary Licence – successes	Less than 95% of target	Missing target but greater than or equal to 95% of target	Greater than or equal to target	N/A

PPT Domain	Performance Measure	Measure Rating			
		1	2	3	4
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Rehabilitation and Release Planning	Outcomes for prisoners are poor	Outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good	Outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good	Outcomes for prisoners are good
Organisational Effectiveness	Incident Reporting System – Data Quality Audit	Audit rating of Unsatisfactory	Audit rating of Limited	Audit rating of Moderate	Audit rating of Substantial
	Incident Reporting System – assaults checks	N/A	Less than 85%	Greater than or equal to 85%	N/A
	Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks	N/A	Less than 85%	Greater than or equal to 85%	N/A
	Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)	1	2	3	4
	Foreign National Offender Referrals	Less than 80%	80% to 89.9%	90% or more	N/A
	Prison Operating within Budget	N/A	Greater than 100% of budget spent	Less than or equal to 100% of budget spent	N/A
	Staff sickness absence	Greater than an average of 12 days per staff member	Greater than 9 days and less than or equal to 12 days	Less than or equal to 9 days	Less than or equal to 9 days and best performing 15% of prisons nationally

## Annex C – Measure Weightings

Performance Measure	Male Closed	Women's	Male Open
Positive Random Mandatory Drug Testing including new psychoactive substances (including months drug testing levels were not met)	5.3%	5.1%	5.3%
Risk Management Audit	4.2%	5.1%	4.3%
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life - safety	3.2%	3.1%	3.1%
Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	4.2%	4.1%	3.5%
Assaults on staff incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	6.3%	6.1%	4.1%
Control and Restraint training	0.8%	0.8%	1.0%
Tornado commitment	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%
Self-harm incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	5.3%	5.1%	3.7%
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Safety	6.5%	6.3%	6.9%
Number of escapes from prison	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Absconds from open prison conditions – rate per 100,000 prisoner days	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%
Security Audit	10.5%	10.2%	4.1%
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – decency	3.2%	3.1%	3.5%
Audit of Living Conditions	5.3%	5.6%	5.8%
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – BME simplified	4.2%	4.1%	4.3%
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Respect	6.5%	6.3%	6.9%
Hours worked by prisoners in industry	1.7%	1.6%	1.8%
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Purposeful Activity	6.5%	6.3%	8.0%
Accredited programmes completions	3.5%	4.9%	0.0%
Release on Temporary Licence – successes	1.7%	1.6%	5.7%
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Rehabilitation and Release Planning	6.5%	6.3%	8.0%
Incident Reporting System – Data Quality Audit	5.3%	5.1%	5.3%
Incident Reporting System – assaults checks	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Foreign National Offender Referrals	1.7%	1.6%	1.8%
Prison Operating within Budget	3.5%	3.4%	3.6%
Staff sickness absence	3.5%	3.4%	3.6%

Due to rounding, the individual measures in each distribution may not sum to exactly 100%.

## Annex D – 2018/19 Prison Comparator Groups

Prison	Comparators							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>Altcourse</b>	Elmley	Nottingham	Thameside	Leeds	Bullington	Forest Bank	Durham	Preston
<b>Ashfield</b>	Stafford	Bure	Usk	Dartmoor	Whatton	Littlehey	Channings Wood	Huntercombe
<b>Askham Grange</b>	East Sutton Park							
<b>Aylesbury</b>	Brinsford	Deerbolt	Feltham					
<b>Bedford</b>	Chelmsford	Peterborough Male	Leicester	Winchester	Exeter	Swansea	Lewes	Bristol
<b>Belmarsh</b>	Woodhill	Manchester						
<b>Birmingham</b>	Pentonville	Wandsworth	Hewell	Wormwood Scrubs	Liverpool	Forest Bank	Bullington	Leeds
<b>Brinsford</b>	Deerbolt	Feltham	Aylesbury					
<b>Bristol</b>	Lincoln	Preston	Durham	Norwich	Altcourse	Elmley	Cardiff	Nottingham
<b>Brixton</b>	Northumberland	Moorland	Risley	Oakwood	Holme House	Wymott	Stocken	Wayland
<b>Bronzefield</b>	Styal	New Hall	Eastwood Park	Peterborough Female	Foston Hall	Low Newton		
<b>Buckley Hall</b>	Haverigg	Featherstone	Guys Marsh	Lancaster Farms	Rochester	Coldingley	Onley	Erlestoke
<b>Bullington</b>	Leeds	Nottingham	Elmley	Altcourse	Thameside	Doncaster	Forest Bank	Norwich
<b>Bure</b>	Usk	Ashfield	Stafford	Dartmoor	Whatton	Littlehey	Channings Wood	Huntercombe

Prison	Comparators							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>Cardiff</b>	Durham	Preston	Norwich	Bristol	Lincoln	Thameside	Altcourse	Elmley
<b>Channings Wood</b>	Huntercombe	Warren Hill	Maidstone	Erlestoke	Onley	Coldingley	Guys Marsh	Featherstone
<b>Chelmsford</b>	Bedford	Peterborough Male	Swansea	Winchester	Leicester	Exeter	Lewes	Bristol
<b>Coldingley</b>	Featherstone	Guys Marsh	Lancaster Farms	Rochester	Onley	Erlestoke	Buckley Hall	Haverigg
<b>Cookham Wood</b>	Wetherby	Werrington						
<b>Dartmoor</b>	Usk	Bure	Ashfield	Stafford	Channings Wood	Huntercombe	Warren Hill	Maidstone
<b>Deerbolt</b>	Brinsford	Feltham	Aylesbury					
<b>Doncaster</b>	Hull	Bullington	Leeds	Nottingham	Altcourse	Elmley	Thameside	Forest Bank
<b>Dovegate</b>	Lowdham Grange	Swaleside	Gartree	Grendon	Garth	Isle of Wight		
<b>Downview</b>	Send	Drake Hall						
<b>Drake Hall</b>	Downview	Send						
<b>Durham</b>	Preston	Norwich	Bristol	Lincoln	Cardiff	Altcourse	Elmley	Nottingham
<b>East Sutton Park</b>	Askham Grange							
<b>Eastwood Park</b>	New Hall	Foston Hall	Peterborough Female	Low Newton	Styal	Bronzefield		
<b>Elmley</b>	Altcourse	Nottingham	Thameside	Leeds	Bullington	Forest Bank	Durham	Preston
<b>Erlestoke</b>	Onley	Coldingley	Featherstone	Guys Marsh	Lancaster Farms	Rochester	Maidstone	Buckley Hall

Prison	Comparators							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>Exeter</b>	Winchester	Leicester	Lewes	Bedford	Chelmsford	Peterborough Male	Swansea	Bristol
<b>Featherstone</b>	Guys Marsh	Lancaster Farms	Rochester	Coldingley	Onley	Erlestoke	Buckley Hall	Haverigg
<b>Feltham – Young People</b>	Cookham Wood	Werrington	Wetherby					
<b>Feltham – Young Adults</b>	Deerbolt	Brinsford	Aylesbury					
<b>Ford</b>	Kirkham	Hollesley Bay	Sudbury	Spring Hill	Thorn Cross	Kirklevington Grange	Hatfield	Prescoed
<b>Forest Bank</b>	Altcourse	Elmley	Thameside	Nottingham	Leeds	Bullingdon	Durham	Preston
<b>Foston Hall</b>	Peterborough Female	New Hall	Eastwood Park	Low Newton	Styal	Bronzefield		
<b>Frankland</b>	Full Sutton	Long Lartin	Whitemoor	Wakefield				
<b>Full Sutton</b>	Frankland	Long Lartin	Whitemoor	Wakefield				
<b>Garth</b>	Grendon	Swaleside	Lowdham Grange	Gartree	Dovegate	Isle of Wight	Rye Hill	
<b>Gartree</b>	Lowdham Grange	Dovegate	Grendon	Garth	Swaleside			
<b>Grendon</b>	Garth	Swaleside	Gartree	Lowdham Grange	Dovegate	Rye Hill	Isle of Wight	
<b>Guys Marsh</b>	Featherstone	Lancaster Farms	Rochester	Coldingley	Onley	Erlestoke	Haverigg	Buckley Hall
<b>Hatfield</b>	Thorn Cross	Spring Hill	Kirklevington Grange	Ford	Sudbury	Kirkham	Hollesley Bay	Prescoed
<b>Haverigg</b>	Buckley Hall	Lancaster Farms	Guys Marsh	Rochester	Featherstone	Coldingley	Onley	Erlestoke
<b>Hewell</b>	Wormwood Scrubs	Pentonville	Wandsworth	Liverpool	Birmingham	Thameside	Altcourse	Elmley

Prison	Comparators							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>High Down</b>	Nottingham	Leeds	Bullington	Elmley	Altcourse	Thameside	Forest Bank	Norwich
<b>Highpoint</b>	Lindholme	Mount	Berwyn	Ranby	Parc	Stocken	Wayland	Wealstun
<b>Hindley</b>	Portland	Isis	Swinfen Hall					
<b>Hollesley Bay</b>	Kirkham	Ford	Sudbury	Kirklevington Grange	Spring Hill	Thorn Cross	Hatfield	Prescoed
<b>Holme House</b>	Risley	Parc	Lindholme	Oakwood	Ranby	Berwyn	Mount	Northumberland
<b>Hull</b>	Doncaster	Bullington	Leeds	Nottingham	Elmley	Altcourse	Thameside	Norwich
<b>Humber</b>	Lancaster Farms	Rochester	Guys Marsh	Featherstone	Coldingley	Onley	Erlestoke	Haverigg
<b>Huntercombe</b>	Maidstone	Warren Hill	Erlestoke	Onley	Coldingley	Guys Marsh	Lancaster Farms	Featherstone
<b>Isis</b>	Portland	Swinfen Hall	Hindley					
<b>Isle of Wight</b>	Rye Hill	Swaleside	Garth	Dovegate	Grendon			
<b>Kirkham</b>	Ford	Hollesley Bay	Sudbury	Kirklevington Grange	Spring Hill	Thorn Cross	Hatfield	Prescoed
<b>Kirklevington Grange</b>	Spring Hill	Thorn Cross	Hatfield	Hollesley Bay	Kirkham	Ford	Sudbury	Prescoed
<b>Lancaster Farms</b>	Rochester	Guys Marsh	Featherstone	Coldingley	Onley	Erlestoke	Haverigg	Buckley Hall
<b>Leeds</b>	Bullington	Nottingham	Altcourse	Elmley	Thameside	Norwich	Preston	Forest Bank
<b>Leicester</b>	Winchester	Exeter	Bedford	Lewes	Chelmsford	Peterborough Male	Swansea	Bristol
<b>Lewes</b>	Winchester	Exeter	Leicester	Bedford	Chelmsford	Peterborough Male	Swansea	Lincoln

Prison	Comparators							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>Leyhill</b>	North Sea Camp	Prescoed	Hollesley Bay	Kirkham	Ford	Sudbury	Kirklevington Grange	Thorn Cross
<b>Lincoln</b>	Bristol	Norwich	Preston	Durham	Nottingham	Altcourse	Elmley	Cardiff
<b>Lindholme</b>	Berwyn	Ranby	Mount	Highpoint	Stocken	Wayland	Wealstun	Stoke Heath
<b>Littlehey</b>	Whatton	Wymott	Bure	Stafford	Moorland	Usk	Ashfield	Northumberland
<b>Liverpool</b>	Hewell	Wormwood Scrubs	Pentonville	Wandsworth	Birmingham	Durham	Preston	Norwich
<b>Long Lartin</b>	Whitemoor	Full Sutton	Frankland	Wakefield				
<b>Low Newton</b>	Foston Hall	Peterborough Female	Eastwood Park	New Hall	Styal	Bronzefield		
<b>Lowdham Grange</b>	Gartree	Dovegate	Grendon	Garth	Swaleside			
<b>Maidstone</b>	Huntercombe	Erlestoke	Onley	Coldingley	Guys Marsh	Featherstone	Lancaster Farms	Rochester
<b>Manchester</b>	Woodhill	Belmarsh						
<b>Moorland</b>	Wymott	Northumberland	Brixton	Risley	Oakwood	Holme House	Parc	Lindholme
<b>Mount</b>	Berwyn	Ranby	Lindholme	Highpoint	Wealstun	Stoke Heath	Wayland	Stocken
<b>New Hall</b>	Eastwood Park	Peterborough Female	Foston Hall	Low Newton	Styal	Bronzefield		
<b>North Sea Camp</b>	Leyhill	Prescoed	Hollesley Bay	Kirkham	Ford	Sudbury	Kirklevington Grange	Spring Hill
<b>Northumberland</b>	Oakwood	Parc	Moorland	Brixton	Risley	Holme House	Wymott	Highpoint
<b>Norwich</b>	Preston	Durham	Lincoln	Bristol	Nottingham	Altcourse	Elmley	Cardiff

Prison	Comparators							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>Nottingham</b>	Altcourse	Elmley	Leeds	Bullington	Thameside	Forest Bank	Norwich	Preston
<b>Oakwood</b>	Northumberland	Parc	Risley	Holme House	Moorland	Highpoint	Brixton	Lindholme
<b>Onley</b>	Coldingley	Rochester	Lancaster Farms	Guys Marsh	Featherstone	Erlestoke	Haverigg	Buckley Hall
<b>Parc</b>	Oakwood	Holme House	Risley	Northumberland	Highpoint	Lindholme	Berwyn	Ranby
<b>Pentonville</b>	Wandsworth	Wormwood Scrubs	Hewell	Birmingham	Liverpool	Forest Bank	Thameside	Elmley
<b>Peterborough Female</b>	Foston Hall	New Hall	Eastwood Park	Low Newton	Styal	Bronzefield		
<b>Peterborough Male</b>	Chelmsford	Bedford	Swansea	Winchester	Leicester	Exeter	Lewes	Cardiff
<b>Portland</b>	Isis	Swinfen Hall	Hindley					
<b>Prescoed</b>	Spring Hill	Thorn Cross	Kirklevington Grange	Hatfield	Ford	Kirkham	Sudbury	Hollesley Bay
<b>Preston</b>	Durham	Norwich	Bristol	Lincoln	Altcourse	Elmley	Cardiff	Nottingham
<b>Ranby</b>	Berwyn	Mount	Lindholme	Highpoint	Wealstun	Stoke Heath	Wayland	Stocken
<b>Risley</b>	Holme House	Parc	Oakwood	Lindholme	Berwyn	Ranby	Mount	Northumberland
<b>Rochester</b>	Lancaster Farms	Guys Marsh	Featherstone	Coldingley	Onley	Erlestoke	Haverigg	Buckley Hall
<b>Rye Hill</b>	Isle of Wight	Garth	Grendon	Swaleside				
<b>Send</b>	Downview	Drake Hall						
<b>Spring Hill</b>	Thorn Cross	Hatfield	Kirklevington Grange	Ford	Kirkham	Hollesley Bay	Sudbury	Prescoed

Prison	Comparators							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>Stafford</b>	Ashfield	Bure	Usk	Dartmoor	Whatton	Littlehey	Channings Wood	Huntercombe
<b>Standford Hill</b>	Hollesley Bay	Kirkham	Ford	Sudbury	Kirklevington Grange	Thorn Cross	Spring Hill	Hatfield
<b>Stocken</b>	Wayland	Wealstun	Stoke Heath	Lindholme	Berwyn	Mount	Ranby	Highpoint
<b>Stoke Heath</b>	Wealstun	Wayland	Stocken	Ranby	Berwyn	Mount	Lindholme	Highpoint
<b>Styal</b>	Bronzefield	New Hall	Eastwood Park	Peterborough Female	Foston Hall	Low Newton		
<b>Sudbury</b>	Ford	Kirkham	Hollesley Bay	Hatfield	Spring Hill	Thorn Cross	Kirklevington Grange	Prescoed
<b>Swaleside</b>	Dovegate	Grendon	Garth	Lowdham Grange	Gartree	Isle of Wight	Rye Hill	
<b>Swansea</b>	Chelmsford	Bedford	Peterborough Male	Winchester	Leicester	Exeter	Lewes	Cardiff
<b>Swinfen Hall</b>	Isis	Portland	Hindley					
<b>Thameside</b>	Altcourse	Elmley	Nottingham	Leeds	Bullingdon	Forest Bank	Durham	Preston
<b>Thorn Cross</b>	Spring Hill	Hatfield	Kirklevington Grange	Ford	Kirkham	Hollesley Bay	Sudbury	Prescoed
<b>Usk</b>	Bure	Ashfield	Stafford	Dartmoor	Whatton	Littlehey	Channings Wood	Warren Hill
<b>Wakefield</b>	Full Sutton	Frankland	Long Lartin	Whitemoor				
<b>Wandsworth</b>	Pentonville	Wormwood Scrubs	Hewell	Birmingham	Liverpool	Forest Bank	Thameside	Altcourse
<b>Warren Hill</b>	Huntercombe	Maidstone	Buckley Hall	Haverigg	Erlestoke	Onley	Coldingley	Featherstone
<b>Wayland</b>	Stocken	Wealstun	Stoke Heath	Lindholme	Berwyn	Mount	Ranby	Highpoint

Prison	Comparators							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>Wealstun</b>	Stoke Heath	Wayland	Stocken	Ranby	Berwyn	Mount	Lindholme	Highpoint
<b>Werrington</b>	Cookham Wood	Wetherby						
<b>Wetherby</b>	Cookham Wood	Werrington						
<b>Whatton</b>	Littlehey	Bure	Usk	Stafford	Wymott	Ashfield	Brixton	Moorland
<b>Whitemoor</b>	Long Lartin	Full Sutton	Frankland	Wakefield				
<b>Winchester</b>	Leicester	Exeter	Bedford	Lewes	Chelmsford	Peterborough Male	Swansea	Bristol
<b>Woodhill</b>	Belmarsh	Manchester						
<b>Wormwood Scrubs</b>	Hewell	Wandsworth	Pentonville	Liverpool	Birmingham	Thameside	Elmley	Altcourse