



## Annual Prison Performance Ratings 2021/22

### Main points

---

**107 prisons were rated as 'Performance is at least acceptable in the circumstances of COVID-19' in 2021/22** 87.7% of the prisons were rated as having at least acceptable performance in the circumstances of Coronavirus (COVID-19).

---

**15 prisons were rated as 'Performance is of concern in the circumstances of COVID-19' in 2021/22** 12.3% of the prisons were rated as of concern in the circumstances of COVID-19.

---

**Open, female closed and male dispersal prisons were strong performers** All female and male open, female closed and male dispersal prisons were rated as 'Performance is at least acceptable in the circumstances of COVID-19'.

---

**Local and Young Offender Institute (YOI) prisons were poor performers** Two of the seven female local prisons (28.6%) and six of the thirty male local prisons (20%) were rated as 'Performance is of concern in the circumstances of COVID-19'. Two of the four (50%) male closed YOI prisons and one out of four (25%) male YOI – young people prisons were rated as of concern.

---

**Performance against key metrics was poor for the majority of the prisons of concern** The 15 prisons rated as 'Performance of concern in the circumstances of COVID-19' performed below the overall average for assaults on staff, prisoner on prisoner assaults, employment at six weeks following release and staff resignation.

---

# 1. Products and Publications related to the Annual Prison Performance Ratings 2021/22

This publication covers reporting for the period between 1 April 2021 and 31 March 2022. Prison performance ratings were not published in the 2020/21 performance year due to the impact of COVID-19 on prison delivery.

A new process has been followed to derive performance ratings for 2021/22 using a data-informed methodology due to the impact of COVID-19 on prison delivery. This has allowed prison performance ratings to be calculated, whilst allowing prisons to manage the pandemic during the year.

As part of the annual moderation process, a data-informed assessment of all prisons was provided. Prisons were assigned provisional ratings as either having 'performance at least acceptable in the circumstances of COVID-19' or 'performance of concern in the circumstances of COVID-19'. Each prison was then scrutinised by HMPPS officials against wider evidence, including data on how COVID-19 had impacted each site, to agree final ratings. Further information can be found in section 3.

Due to the methodology changes, Annual Prison Performance Ratings 2021/22 are released as standalone ratings and comparisons have deliberately not been made to previous years.

The following products are published as part of this release:

- A **statistical bulletin**, containing commentary on key findings;
- A set of **supplementary tables**, providing underlying data and the performance rating for each measure by prison.
- **Annual Prison Performance Ratings Guide 2021/22**, providing further information on how the data are collected and processed to derive prison performance ratings.

The **Annual Prison Performance Ratings Guide 2021/22** and **supplementary tables** are available to download from:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/announcements/prison-performance-ratings-2021-to-2022>

The following publications contain related statistics:

- **HMPPS Annual Digest 2021/22:**  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/announcements/hmppps-annual-digest-april-2021-to-march-2022>
- **Safety in Custody quarterly: update to March 2022:**  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/announcements/safety-in-custody-quarterly-update-to-march-2022>

## 2. Prison Performance Framework

HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) manage the performance framework that was structured against six main outcome areas, defined as domains, which reflect HMPPS priorities. For 2021/22 these were:

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

One new measure was introduced into the framework in 2021/22. This was:

- Safety Audit. This audit replaces the Risk Management Audit. As not all prisons received a Safety Audit in the year, data for both audits was included in assessments.

There were 23 performance measures in the prison performance framework that are included in the publication. Due to limitations with the data due to COVID-19 affecting the validity of the information, data for the Mandatory Drug Testing and Male Closed Keyworker measures is not included in the publication. Also, data for the Accredited Programme Completions metric has not yet been finalised for 2021/22 and it is not included in the publication.

The Prison Management Information Tool (PMIT) was developed to monitor prisons against this performance framework. The PMIT replaced the PPT for 2021/22 and reported the latest available management information whilst not providing a formal in year performance assessment.

Further information about the performance framework and PMIT, including the performance measures that make up each domain can be found in the Prison Performance Ratings Guide accompanying this bulletin.

Annual performance for each prison has been assigned one of two ratings. These ratings are:

Rating	Description
Acceptable	Performance is at least acceptable in the circumstances of COVID-19.
Concern	Performance is of concern in the circumstances of COVID-19.

### 3. Annual Prison Performance Ratings

---

**107 prisons were rated as ‘Performance is at least acceptable in the circumstances of COVID-19’ in 2021/22**

87.7% of the prisons were rated as having at least acceptable performance in the circumstances of COVID-19.

---

**15 prisons were rated as ‘Performance is of concern in the circumstances of COVID-19’ in 2021/22**

12.3% of the prisons were rated as of concern in the circumstances of COVID-19.

---

A data-informed assessment of each prison was provided to assign provisional ratings to each prison. To classify a prison as of concern, the performance relative to prisons of the same function and other prisons in the comparator group was assessed.

As part of the prison performance year a moderation process was undertaken in June 2022 to determine the final performance ratings. Operational factors such as staffing and COVID-19, HM Inspectorate of Prisons reports, large scale incidents and prisons subject to central HMPPS support was considered.

Through the moderation process, each prison’s data was scrutinised in detail. Particular focus was given to prisons where officials agreed with the assessment that the prison had performance of concern in the circumstances of COVID-19. Attention was also drawn where there were differing views from officials on whether performance was acceptable or of concern and further discussion took place to decide a final rating.

Separately, HMIP invoked the Urgent Notification (UN)<sup>1</sup> process at Chelmsford in August 2021. Chelmsford was discussed by officials and a rating of concern was applied. Parc had an escape in 2021/22 and was also discussed by officials. Given the data and the circumstances in the year, Parc was rated as having performance which is at least acceptable.

The performance rating of 3 prisons were adjusted following discussions by officials, all moving from a rating as of concern to a rating of at least acceptable performance.

**Figure 1: Summary of Annual Prison Performance Ratings for 2021/22 (Source: Table 2)**

<b>Prison Ratings 2021/22</b>	<b>Number of prisons</b>	<b>Percentage of prisons</b>
Acceptable	107	87.7%
Concern	15	12.3%

---

<sup>1</sup> An Urgent Notification is invoked when HMIP identify significant concerns with regard to the treatment and conditions of those detained. For more information see <https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-hmi-prisons/urgent-notifications/>

**Figure 2: Annual Prison Performance Ratings 2021/22 (Source: Table 2)**

Prison	Rating	Prison	Rating	Prison	Rating
Altcourse	A	Gartree	A	Onley	A
Ashfield	A	Grendon	A	Parc	A
Askham Grange	A	Guys Marsh	A	Pentonville	C
Aylesbury	C	Hatfield	A	Peterborough Female	A
Bedford	C	Haverigg	A	Peterborough Male	A
Belmarsh	A	Hewell	A	Portland	A
Berwyn	A	High Down	A	Prescoed	A
Birmingham	A	Highpoint	A	Preston	A
Brinsford	A	Hindley	A	Ranby	A
Bristol	A	Hollesley Bay	A	Risley	A
Brixton	C	Holme House	A	Rochester	A
Bronzefield	A	Hull	A	Rye Hill	A
Buckley Hall	A	Humber	A	Send	A
Bullingdon	A	Huntercombe	A	Spring Hill	A
Bure	A	Isis	A	Stafford	A
Cardiff	A	Isle of Wight	A	Standford Hill	A
Channings Wood	A	Kirkham	A	Stocken	A
Chelmsford	C	Kirklevington Grange	A	Stoke Heath	A
Coldingley	A	Lancaster Farms	A	Styal	A
Cookham Wood	A	Leeds	A	Sudbury	A
Dartmoor	A	Leicester	A	Swaleside	C
Deerbolt	C	Lewes	A	Swansea	A
Doncaster	A	Leyhill	A	Swinfen Hall	A
Dovegate	A	Lincoln	A	Thameside	A
Downview	A	Lindholme	A	Thorn Cross	A
Drake Hall	A	Littlehey	A	Usk	A
Durham	A	Liverpool	A	Verne	A
East Sutton Park	A	Long Lartin	A	Wakefield	A
Eastwood Park	C	Low Newton	A	Wandsworth	C
Elmley	A	Lowdham Grange	A	Warren Hill	A
Erlestoke	A	Maidstone	A	Wayland	C
Exeter	A	Manchester	A	Wealstun	A
Featherstone	A	Moorland	A	Werrington	C
Feltham A	A	Morton Hall	A	Wetherby	A
Feltham B	A	Mount	A	Whatton	A
Ford	A	New Hall	A	Whitmoor	A
Forest Bank	C	North Sea Camp	A	Winchester	C
Foston Hall	C	Northumberland	A	Woodhill	C
Frankland	A	Norwich	A	Wormwood Scrubs	A
Full Sutton	A	Nottingham	A	Wymott	A
Garth	A	Oakwood	A		

**Key:** Rating A = Performance is at least acceptable in the circumstances of COVID-19  
Rating C = Performance is of concern in the circumstances of COVID-19

## 4. Prison Function Ratings and Performance Drivers

---

### **Open, female closed and male dispersal prisons were strong performers**

All female and male open, female closed and male dispersal prisons were rated as 'Performance is at least acceptable in the circumstances of COVID-19'.

---

### **Local and Young Offender Institute (YOI) prisons were poor performers**

Two of the seven female local prisons (28.6%) and six of the thirty male local prisons (20%) were rated as 'Performance is of concern in the circumstances of COVID-19'. Two of the four (50%) male closed YOI prisons and one out of four (25%) male YOI – young people prisons were rated as of concern.

---

### **Performance in key measures was poor for the majority of the prisons of concern**

The 15 prisons rated as 'Performance of concern in the circumstances of COVID-19' performed below the overall average for assaults on staff, prisoner on prisoner assaults, employment at six weeks following release and staff resignation.

---

### **Strong performers**

Both female and male open prisons were rated as having at least acceptable performance in the circumstances of COVID-19. Open prisons accommodate Category D prisoners whose risk of absconding is low, or who are of low risk to the public because of the way they have addressed their offending behaviour. These prisons had the lowest levels of assaults and self-harm incidents in 2021/22 and were rated as reasonably good or good for each of the healthy prison tests in their most recent HMIP inspection. Open prisons performed well in the accommodation on the first night following release, the employment at six weeks following release and the staff resignation rate measures.

All female closed and male dispersal prisons were also rated as at least acceptable. Their assaults on staff and prisoner on prisoner assaults rates were below the overall average and were rated as having acceptable or exceptional performance for the Security Audit. Both female closed and male dispersal performed well on the accommodation on the first night following release measure.

The performance of the 15 prisons of concern on the accommodation on the first night following release was good, with twelve of them having performance close to the overall average. They also performed well on the Audit of Living Conditions and Incident Reporting System (IRS) Data Quality Audit. They performed relatively well on the self-harm measure, with more than half of them having lower rates than the overall average self-harm rate.

Prisons of concern performed well on security measures with no escapes and 66.7% of them rated as having acceptable or exceptional performance for the Security Audit.

**Figure 3: Annual Prison Performance Ratings 2021/22 by Prison Function<sup>2</sup> (Source: Table 3)**



### Poor performers

Of the prisons rated as of concern, six were male local prisons and two were female local prisons. Offenders accommodated at male local prisons are either on remand or serving short-term custodial sentences, meaning environments will be more dynamic than those prisons with longer-term serving offenders with a limited time to rehabilitate offenders. 50% of the male closed YOI prisons and 25% of the male YOI - young people prisons were rated as concern. Both local prisons and YOIs have high rates on assaults.

Employment at six weeks following release was a poor performing measure for the prisons of concern, with 80% of them to be below the overall average. The performance on staff resignation and both prisoner on prisoner and staff assaults was not the best for the 15 establishments rated as of concern, with most of them to have rates above the overall average. 66.7% of them had no successful releases on temporary licence and 86.7% were rated as not sufficiently good or poor for the purposeful activity test in their most recent HMIP inspection.

<sup>2</sup> For definitions of the Prison Functions, please see the Annual Prison Performance Ratings Guide 2021/22.

## 5. Further Information

### Statistical Code of Practice

This publication has followed the principles and practices from the Code of Practice:

#### Trustworthiness

The ratings and data in this publication have been produced with the most recent data available, which has been validated through the Custody Data Assurance Team in the Data and Analysis Directorate in the Ministry of Justice. Prisons have had the opportunity to scrutinise and challenge data they deemed to be inaccurate throughout the performance year, through quarterly releases of the Prison Management Information Tool, and monthly updates to the Performance Hub – an internal HMPPS Management Information system.

#### Quality

Appropriate data sources were used for each measure, identified through engagement with prison staff and colleagues in HMPPS Head Quarters. The prison performance framework was agreed at the start of the performance year and this, along with technical notes accompanying each performance measure, were shared with prisons on the Performance Hub and discussed at prison forums. Problems with measures are worked through with prisons to see how they can be overcome. Data has been removed where COVID-19 has affected the reliability.

Prisons were informed at the start of the reporting period that their annual rating and underlying data were to be published following completion of the year.

The data in this publication have been quality assured alongside the Official-Statistics HMPPS Annual Digest 2021/22 and National Statistics Safety in Custody Quarterly: Update to March 2022 for consistency. Any intentional differences have been highlighted in the data of this publication.

#### Value

The data in this publication provide an overview of prison performance within the year. Making this information accessible provides ministers and users with an overview of prisons performance, while helping to reduce the administrative burden of answering Parliamentary Questions, Freedom of Information requests and ad hoc queries. This information also allows Ministry of Justice/ HMPPS to monitor and performance manage prisons and provide all users with transparent data that underpins overall prison performance.

Data are published in Open Document format to ensure compatibility across different systems. Information is also available on the Justice Data website that enables users to access all data used to assess prison performance.



## Official Statistics

General information about the official statistics system of the UK is available from:

<https://uksa.statisticsauthority.gov.uk/about-the-authority/uk-statistical-system/>

Ministry of Justice publishes data relating to offender management in England and Wales. Equivalent statistics for Scotland and Northern Ireland can be found at:

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/?cat=filter&publicationTypes=statistics>

<https://www.justice-ni.gov.uk/topics/statistics-and-research/statistics-and-research-publications>

## Contact

Press enquiries should be directed to the Ministry of Justice press office:

Tel: 0203 334 3536

E-mail: [PressOfficePrisonsDesk@justice.gov.uk](mailto:PressOfficePrisonsDesk@justice.gov.uk)

Other enquiries about these statistics should be directed to:

**Ed Rowland, Head of Prison Performance**

Email: [PPRWS\\_Correspondence@justice.gov.uk](mailto:PPRWS_Correspondence@justice.gov.uk)

**Next Update: TBC**

**URL:** <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/prison-and-probation-trusts-performance-statistics>

© Crown copyright

Produced by the Ministry of Justice

Alternative formats are available on request from [PPRWS\\_Correspondence@justice.gov.uk](mailto:PPRWS_Correspondence@justice.gov.uk)