



HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales

Annual Report 2022–23

HC 1451

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales

Annual Report 2022–23

For the period 1 April 2022
to 31 March 2023

Presented to Parliament pursuant to
Section 5A of the Prison Act 1952.

Ordered by the House of Commons
to be printed on 5 July 2023.



© Crown Copyright 2023

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v.3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit:
www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/

Where we have identified any third party copyright information, you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at:
www.gov.uk/official-documents and
www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at:
hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk

ISBN: 978-1-5286-4266-8
E02934995 07/23

Contents

Introduction by the Chief Inspector of Prisons		6
Who we are and what we do		21
One	The year in brief	24
Two	Leadership	29
Three	Men in prison	38
	Safety	42
	Respect	56
	Purposeful activity	77
	Rehabilitation and release planning	92
Four	Women in prison	106
	Safety	109
	Respect	111
	Purposeful activity	113
	Preparation for release	115

Five	Children in custody	117
	Safety	121
	Care	125
	Purposeful activity	128
	Resettlement	130
Six	Immigration detention	133
Seven	Court custody	145
Eight	The Inspectorate	152
Nine	Appendices	172
Glossary		222
Website references		229

Introduction

by the Chief Inspector of Prisons



Despite final COVID-19 restrictions being lifted in May 2022, we found far too many prisons continuing to operate greatly reduced regimes in the last year. This meant that prisoners remained locked in their cells for long periods of time without the purposeful activity that would support a successful reintegration back into society at the end of their sentences. Over the last year I have consistently raised concerns with governors, the prison service and ministers that prisoners who have not had sufficient opportunities to become involved with education, training or work, and have spent their sentences languishing in their cells, are more likely to reoffend when they come out. Prisons have a duty to protect the public and act as a punishment for those who have offended, but they also have an obligation to make sure that prisoners in their care are given the help they need to move away from crime into more productive lives. It is poor use of the average of £45,000 a year to keep someone in prison if, when they come out, they return to criminality and create more victims of crime.

I have been given many reasons for the lack of regime, which have included insufficient prison officer numbers, inexperience of staff, industrial relations, overcrowding, and poor delivery by prison education providers, but much of the failure must come down to leadership within both prisons and the prison service.

When we inspected jails where strong leaders had ambitious plans to get prisoners out of their cells, such as at Coldingley or Channings Wood, there was drive and momentum to get back to pre-pandemic levels of activity. While I recognise the challenges in reopening regimes and am not encouraging practice that would increase the risk of violence for either prisoners or staff, I have become increasingly frustrated by prisons whose future plans are so vague that it is hard to see when progress is going to be made.

In some jails we came across a nervousness that opening the regime would lead to levels of violence that prisons had experienced before the pandemic, but the evidence for many years has been clear – that ultimately, locking prisoners away in their cells does not make them, staff or the public safer. In prisons such as Elmley or Erlestoke we found prisoners out of their cells for longer than elsewhere without any notable increase in violence.

It has been in category C prisons that I have been most concerned about levels of activity. Designated either as training or resettlement prisons, their remit is to help prisoners fill the gaps in their skills and experience to allow them to make a successful return to the community. Unlike reception jails, some prisoners will spend many years in category C establishments, making their role in supporting prisoners' progress crucial. Many, such as Onley and Ranby, are situated in large open sites with some very good facilities. It was therefore disappointing to find in such prisons

empty workshops, overgrown farms and gardens, broken greenhouses, and demotivated and disillusioned prisoners either locked in their cells or aimlessly stuck on the wing with nothing meaningful to do.

While in some category C jails there were acute staffing difficulties, overall, there did not appear to be a correlation between staffing levels and levels of purposeful activity. HM Prison and Probation Service has worked hard to reduce the supply of drugs, with better gate security, use of dogs and technology, meaning the risk of a return to pre-pandemic levels of violence is lower. The challenge for governors, the prison service and ministers must be to increase significantly activities on offer while maintaining good levels of control and safety.

Elsewhere in the male estate, there were some encouraging inspections of reception prisons where we had previously been highly critical. Under strong leadership, Bedford and Liverpool were safer and more respectful than they had been in the past and we found promising if fragile progress in independent reviews of progress at Winchester, Chelmsford and Hull. Other historically risky prisons such as Leeds, Nottingham, Doncaster and Hewell also achieved improved safety scores. Staff working in reception prisons often told me that they felt safer than they had before the pandemic when the unstemmed flow of drugs resulted in exceptionally high levels of violence. Rates of violence, however, continued to be too high with assaults on staff a serious problem in many prisons.

The living conditions in reception prisons remained a serious cause of concern, despite some improvements, particularly in showers, where there had been considerable spending by the prison service. Many establishments were overcrowded, with prisoners sharing a small cell designed for one, with a poorly screened lavatory in the corner. In many cells we found insufficient ventilation or broken windowpanes that left prisoners cold in the winter. In the summer heatwaves, the top landings of some older prisons were stifling. With prison population figures only expected to increase, I will be monitoring the impact of overcrowding very closely, not least the effect it has on purposeful activity and time out of cell.

In these jails, prisoners continued to be locked in their cells for unacceptably long periods of time, with those who were not working or in education often only getting out for one or two hours a day. Prisoners frequently told me of the psychological effects of these long lock ups on a population with fragile mental health. Many were desperate to get into workshops or education, but insufficient staffing, combined with over-complicated and slow allocation processes, meant that they stayed stuck in their cells.

Our inspection of Exeter prison, which led to the issuing of a second, consecutive Urgent Notification, revealed some of the highest levels of self-harm in male comparator prisons and that 10 prisoners had taken their lives since our last full inspection in 2018.

This was an example of what goes wrong when leadership is not consistent or of high quality; four governors, eight deputy governors and eight heads of safety had been in post since our 2018 inspection.

The proportion of those on remand remained above historic averages and we frequently reported on the disadvantages these prisoners faced. Ignored by the new unification of probation services contracts, remand prisoners received less support than before the changes. Newly remanded prisoners were lucky if they got help with tenancy arrangements or debt and in our thematic work, we came across some particularly concerning cases where women had been unable to make suitable arrangements before going into prison and had been burgled or had their identities stolen while they were on remand.

At the beginning of the year, many prison libraries inexplicably remained closed or maintained heavy restrictions on access. While we began to see improvements as the year went on, access had largely not returned to pre-pandemic levels. Staff shortages meant that gym sessions continued to be cancelled or the number of prisoners able to use the facilities was heavily reduced, adding to the frustrations of those in reception jails.

In recent years we have been more positive about the quality of health care, but I have begun to be concerned about some prisons, where a lack of staff or an

over-reliance on agency workers is leading to reductions in service. Health services are often kept going by small, dedicated teams of professionals, but there is an emerging fragility about much of what we have seen this year, particularly the support for mental health problems.

Our joint thematic report with HM Inspectorate of Probation, published in November, highlighted many concerns with the offender management in custody (OMIC) model that was designed to improve the sharing of information and preparation for release. Key work with a named officer was supposed to be at the heart of the process, whereby prisoners were to be guided through their sentences and supported during their last months in prison to make the transfer back to the community.

Disappointingly, we only found effective key work in two prisons we inspected, while elsewhere it was piecemeal or tokenistic at best and was usually reserved for only the most vulnerable. Key work was disrupted or cancelled because of staff shortages, and few prisoners were getting the support for which it was designed. This was compounded by the often very reduced staff numbers that we found in offender management units, where staff were too often cross-deployed to work on the wings.

I remained concerned about the support for men serving lengthy or indeterminate sentences – including those imprisoned for public protection – to access programmes that enabled them to reduce their risk and so progress in their sentence plans. Aside from

this group of men being in particular need of such interventions for public protection, feeling unable to make progress towards any kind of goal can seriously affect mental health and overall well-being.

Our inspections continued to show disparities between different groups that had not been analysed or addressed by prisons. Our thematic report into the experiences of black prisoners and black staff showed that there is a long way to go to make prisons fairer. We proposed practical solutions and suggestions to help break down the barriers, misunderstanding and lack of trust that exists, particularly between white staff and black prisoners, and we look forward to seeing progress in this area.

Women's prisons

There continued to be fewer women in prison than before the pandemic, but low staffing levels in some jails meant that there were missed opportunities to make material improvements to the quality of provision. The mixed population in women's prisons – between those on short sentences who are caught in the cycle of mental health difficulties, homelessness, substance misuse and offending, and those who are serving long sentences for serious offences – added to the complexity of these jails. These prisons require a team with very particular skills, knowledge and values who are able to engage, challenge and support the women in their care. We come across many outstanding staff in women's

prisons who demonstrate these qualities, and saw some excellent practice this year, particularly in specialist provision for women with personality disorders and some well-planned resettlement work for those approaching release. However, where there were shortages of staff, interactions could be transactional and cursory.

We continued to be very concerned about the treatment of women who were displaying the most extreme mental health difficulties, particularly those who prolifically self-harmed. Many of them should not have been in prison and in most cases, the wait to transfer to hospital remained much too long. Prison officers and other staff do not have enough expertise to care for women with very complex needs and a huge amount of prison resource is taken up by a small number of cases. In this report we highlight some very concerning practice at Eastwood Park and continuing difficulties at Foston Hall. Across the estate we continued to see women locked in their cells for too long and not enough opportunities to work, socialise or attend education. Given the lower risk that most women pose, there is no excuse for the poor outcomes in purposeful activity and a real drive from governors and the regional director is required to transform this situation.

In the women's estate we hear lots of talk of 'trauma-informed' prisons, but those who use the term cannot always articulate what they mean by it. Staff and leaders will require more training and

there needs to be a deep commitment to changing the culture if this concept is to become more than just a catchphrase in women's prisons.

The children's estate

The number of children in custody remained historically low, with a greater proportion than ever on remand. While there continued to be children serving short sentences, the proportion who had committed the most serious offences had grown and it was not unusual to come across children who were in the early stages of very long sentences. Levels of violence remained much too high in almost all of the young offender institutions (YOIs) and secure training centres we inspected, with the exception of Parc YOI, which remained the safest and most productive institution. Elsewhere regimes continued to be limited; no other YOI got children out of their cells for longer than 6.5 hours a day, with even less time at weekends. The fear of violence had created a vicious circle that meant children were more likely to carry and use weapons, ostensibly for self-protection, but which predictably resulted in further incidents. Some children coming into custody could bring in conflict from outside, particularly when they were involved with gangs, but this was compounded by allocating them to small groups that had themselves taken on gang-like affiliation and behaviour. Attempts to get larger groups of children into education therefore led to increased conflict and the cancellation or restriction of activities.

YOIs have reverted to extensive and complicated ‘keep apart’ lists to prevent children in conflict with each other from mixing. While these seem expedient in the short-term, prisons that adopt this policy usually remain the most violent, and regimes inevitably are reduced because different groups have to be locked away before others can be let out. The boredom leads to children calling out to each other through windows or cell doors and creating further hostility. More focus on resolving conflict and motivating good behaviour is a much better solution to reducing violence.

Immigration

Our inspections of immigration removal centres (IRCs) were fairly positive last year, with reasonable conditions and generally good staff-detainee relationships.

The centres for men continued to be unnecessarily bleak, although there had been some good work to improve the situation for women, where environments tended to be better appointed and less prison-like.

We were concerned that the number of detainees was rising and had left some of the centres feeling crowded with, at times, too few activity spaces.

We continued to see detainees being held for too long, particularly those for whom there did not appear to be any chance of deportation taking place. Insufficient suitable community accommodation meant that some detainees with mental health difficulties remained in IRCs where there was a considerable risk that their condition would deteriorate. Our thematic report on

immigration detainees held in prisons showed that they did not receive the same entitlements as those in IRCs. The Home Office continued to take too long to process cases, creating uncertainty and frustration for detainees and considerable cost to the taxpayer. We came across some improvements in engagement from Home Office staff in IRCs, but decisions about cases were still not being made quickly enough.

In the summer we inspected the new short-term holding facility at Manston and returned to those at Dover and Folkstone. We were pleased to see some improvements in the processing of detainees at Western Jet Foil, but we remained concerned about the treatment of families and individual children at the Kent Intake Unit, which was not a suitable environment for vulnerable groups. New facilities were due to open later in the year which should lead to improvements in care.

When we inspected Manston, the number of detainees was relatively low and most were being processed through the facility fairly quickly in conditions that were tolerable for short stays. We were, however, concerned about the quality of health care, which was inadequate for the needs of the population, and we were disappointed to see a failure to use interpreters (other than for asylum screening interviews) and to identify potential victims of torture or those with mental health difficulties. We raised concerns about the time that some detainees were spending at the site and when I visited in September, I found things had deteriorated.

By October we were hearing very concerning reports from credible sources that there was severe overcrowding and a failure by the Home Office to find suitable accommodation, so that detainees were therefore spending far too long at a site that is inadequate for anything more than a 24-hour stay. At that time, I announced that we would return to the site in the near future to assess what progress had been made.

Court custody

The treatment of prisoners in court custody continued to be reasonably good and staff were generally supportive and kind to those in their care. Safeguarding arrangements were still not good enough in some courts and further training was required for all staff. We generally saw better partnership work between the agencies involved in court custody and more coordination of services. Conditions in court cells continued to be poor in some areas, with not enough for detainees to do to help them pass the time, but usually their basic needs were met by staff. We were concerned about the lack of prison places, leading to delays in transferring detainees from court custody because vans were not always available at the right time, particularly where there were shortages of drivers.

All of the services inspected by HMI Prisons in 2022–23 suffered from difficulties with recruiting and retaining enough staff. In some jails wings were closed and elsewhere there were simply not

enough officers to run a regime. Shortages did not, however, just apply to officers, and in many prisons there were not enough trainers or teachers to run workshops; this resulted in cancellations and very limited purposeful activity. Some establishments struggled to recruit administration or operational support grade staff, and officers were sometimes taken away from the wings to fulfil these functions. Governors also complained that the inexperience of staff meant they were nervous about opening up regimes, but given the amount of time since the pandemic, this excuse was beginning to sound very thin.

It remains astonishing that prison governors play no part in the selection of officers who work in their prison and that some only meet new staff on their first day at work. Governors have frequently told me that they get new recruits who are not suitable for the role and the number who leave within the first year seems to support this assessment.

Some prisons are beginning to think creatively about how they can look after new and less experienced staff and with the current pressures this must remain a priority. It is too early to see the longer-term effects of recent pay rises, but it is clear that for many prisons, particularly in the south of England, this will continue to be a challenge. The prison service does not do enough to nurture and retain its most talented staff to help them to become the leaders of the future.

As ever, it is the quality of leadership that makes the most difference in all places of detention. One of the most valuable resources in our prisons is the best 20 or 30 governors who are visionary, dynamic, courageous and inspiring. If the prison service was able to make better use of their expertise, from both the public and private sectors, much more progress could be made. It continues to be far more hierarchical than other public services, with limits on autonomy at every level that stifle creativity and risk-taking.

In the next year I hope to see a significant improvement in the amount of time prisoners are spending in purposeful activity. The best governors have showed us what is possible; it is time for others to follow.

I continue to be enormously proud of my team at HMI Prisons; they are dedicated, passionate and determined and I am hugely grateful for their outstanding work in the last year. I know how much disruption and stress is caused when the Inspectorate arrives, and I want to thank prison and immigration leaders and staff for welcoming our input and engaging with the process. We are made universally welcome, despite the hard messages that we sometimes have to give.

Charlie Taylor
Chief Inspector of Prisons

Who we are and what we do



Our purpose

To ensure independent inspection of places of detention, report on conditions and treatment, and promote positive outcomes for those detained and the public.

Our remit

Our remit is primarily set out in sections 5A and 43 of the Prison Act 1952 (as amended). We inspect:

- adult men’s and women’s prisons in England and Wales
- young offender institutions (YOIs) in England and Wales
- secure training centres (STCs) in England
- court custody in England and Wales
- all forms of immigration detention throughout the UK and overseas escorts
- other facilities by invitation, such as military detention facilities in the UK, and prisons in Northern Ireland (on behalf of Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland), on the Isle of Man and Channel Islands, and in some other overseas jurisdictions with links to the UK.

Our healthy establishment tests

We inspect against four tests of a healthy establishment. For men's prisons, these are:

- **Safety** – prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.
- **Respect** – prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.
- **Purposeful activity** – prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them.
- **Rehabilitation and release planning** – prisoners are supported to maintain and develop relationships with their family and friends. Prisoners are helped to reduce their likelihood of reoffending and their risk of harm is managed effectively. Prisoners are prepared for their release into the community.

The tests for women's prisons, YOIs and immigration detention facilities vary slightly, based on the specific circumstances applying to those detained.

Find out more about our inspection approach in Section 8.

One

The year in brief



Between 1 April 2022 and 31 March 2023 we published 83 inspection, independent review of progress and thematic reports.



Adult prisons (England and Wales)

- Full inspections of 36 prisons holding adult men.
- Full inspection of separation centres holding adult men.
- Independent reviews of progress (IRPs) at 15 prisons holding adult men.
- Inspections of three prisons holding adult women.
- IRP at one prison holding adult women.



Establishments holding children and young people

- Full inspections of three young offender institutions (YOIs) holding children under the age of 18.
- IRPs at five YOIs.
- Inspection of one secure training centre (STC) holding children aged 12 to 18, jointly with Ofsted.



Immigration detention

- Inspection of three immigration removal centres (IRCs).
- Inspection of residential short-term holding facilities (STHFs) for migrants arriving across the English Channel.
- Inspection of one overseas charter flight removal.



Court custody

- Inspection of three court custody areas.



Military detention

- Inspection of HM Armed Forces Service Custody Facilities.
- Inspection of the Military Corrective Training Centre.

In October 2022, we also carried out an extra-jurisdiction inspection in Northern Ireland. This report will be covered in the 2023–24 Annual Report.



Other publications

In 2022–23, we published the following additional publications:

- **The experiences of adult black male prisoners and black prison staff**
- **The experience of immigration detainees in prisons**
- **Children in Custody 2021–22**
- **The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the criminal justice system – a progress report** (Criminal Justice Joint Inspection)
- **Twenty years on, is MAPPA achieving its objectives?** (Criminal Justice Joint Inspection)

- **A thematic review of outcomes for girls in custody** (jointly with HMI Probation, Ofsted, Care Quality Commission and Care Inspectorate Wales)
- **A joint thematic inspection of Offender Management in Custody – pre-release** (jointly with HMI Probation)
- **Weekends in prison** (report finalised in March 2023, published in April 2023).

During the year we issued one Urgent Notification letter to the Secretary of State for Justice expressing our serious concerns immediately following an inspection of a prison.

We also made written submissions to a range of consultations and inquiries, commented on draft Detention Services Orders and gave oral evidence to Parliamentary committees, including:



Written submissions

- Justice Committee, Pre-legislative scrutiny of the draft Victims Bill, Criminal Justice Joint Inspection submission (June 2022).
- Joint Committee on the draft Mental Health Bill (September 2022).
- Equality and Human Rights Commission, Statutory review of equality and human rights in Britain (28 February 2023).



Oral evidence

- Justice Select Committee, The work of the criminal justice inspectorates (17 May 2022).
- Justice Select Committee, The role of adult custodial remand in the criminal justice system (25 October 2022).
- Joint Committee on Human Rights, Human rights of asylum seekers in the UK (16 November 2022).
- Justice Select Committee, The prison operational workforce (21 March 2023).


Our reports and publications are available online at:
www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons

Find out about report publication and other news via our Twitter account.

Go to: www.twitter.com/HMIPrisonsnews or
[@HMIPrisonsnews](https://twitter.com/HMIPrisonsnews)

Two

Leadership



The findings in the following section are based on our leadership expectations for adult men’s prisons, women’s prisons and young offender institutions, introduced in July 2021.

Clear direction leads to improvement

Improvement in prisons was most evident where senior leaders had provided a clear direction and set ambitious targets for their teams. Where leaders were more visible, staff tended to understand and be more supportive of the prison’s priorities. In around 80% of the prisons inspected, there had been at least one change in governor since the previous inspection.

Leaders were conducting more regular self-assessment, and use of data to understand their prisons’ strengths and weaknesses was improving, but too frequently there was a lack of detailed planning and robust oversight to make sure that improvements were made at pace and sustained over time.

Data analysis was good but leaders needed to make sure that there were comprehensive strategies and action plans, for example in safety, to promote a prison-wide approach and drive continuous improvement. **Featherstone**

Frontline and middle leadership were crucial in driving improvement and delivering good outcomes for prisoners. Over the past year, we found many examples of excellent leadership by functional heads and custodial managers. Leadership in health care was also notable in many prisons. However, leadership teams often consisted of new or temporarily promoted functional heads and custodial managers, and in some key roles there was an unmanageable turnover of new appointments. At Exeter, where there had been eight heads of safety and eight deputy governors between two inspections, this was a key factor in the Chief Inspector issuing an unprecedented second Urgent Notification (see Glossary) to the Secretary of State for Justice.

Unstable leadership is the key reason for the failings in this report and reflects poorly on the involvement and support from HMPPS... The constant change of managers in areas including safety, residential units, health care and activity resulted in processes that were not robust enough to safeguard outcomes for prisoners. **Exeter Urgent Notification, 18 November 2022**

In many cases, largely inexperienced leaders faced substantial challenges in reinstating systems and procedures that had been on hold during the COVID-19 pandemic. Although staff mentors had been appointed in most prisons, our staff survey indicated a major deficit in management support for staff well-being: 23% of all staff said they met a manager or mentor only once a year or less; 25% said their morale at work was low and a further 15% that it was very low. Custodial managers and functional heads often had to juggle competing demands, which meant they spent too little time coaching and mentoring staff. This situation clearly contributed to high attrition rates. Some governors were particularly active in their efforts to mitigate the absence of regular, supportive line management.

Visible, rigorous and empathetic senior leadership had supported the prison's ongoing recovery from the low point of the previous full inspection. The governor had improved the capability of his leadership team and encouraged collaborative working. **Bedford**

Staff shortages impact on outcomes

Major staff shortfalls continued to have a devastating effect on the delivery of good outcomes for prisoners. The staffing challenge was not confined to frontline officers but extended across all services, including health, education and offender management. Many prisons

struggled to recruit and retain staff in important roles, which undermined efforts to deliver a purposeful regime. The problem was compounded by the absence of staff through sickness, suspension and temporary promotion. In some prisons, there were not enough operational staff to facilitate prisoner access and supervision in work and education, which sometimes left teachers and tutors in almost empty classes and workshops.

National and local leaders made meaningful efforts to recruit and retain staff through advertising and improved financial incentives. The use of detached duty staff from fully staffed prisons and overtime bonus schemes plugged some gaps but did not provide a meaningful solution to the shortfalls. Recruitment and retention problems were broadly attributable to the current employment climate and market forces, but evidence from inspections also indicated other factors, including a negative prison culture, lack of management support and unmet expectations about the nature of prison work.

... the level of prison officer attrition (28%) was one of the highest in the country, and more than 50 officers had resigned in the previous 12 months... Those who responded to our staff survey made more negative comments than we usually see, suggesting a lack of positive staff engagement. **Norwich**

Continuing restrictions on time out of cell

Staff shortages, a lack of purposeful activity and a national drive to replace traditional association time for prisoners with ‘structured on-wing activity’ had resulted in poor time out of cell. Despite the lifting of national regime restrictions in May 2022, leaders’ focus on safety was not always sufficiently balanced with the need to rehabilitate prisoners. The role of the residential officer was often limited to unlocking prisoners to enable a very basic regime with little time prioritised for key work (see Glossary) or meaningful interaction. There was often greater priority placed on safety and security than offender management and the staffing of education and work areas. Some leaders had continued the pandemic measure of ‘cohorting’ prisoners in small groups to limit conflict, but this further reduced regular access to purposeful and rehabilitative activities.

Leaders were not providing an adequate or sufficiently predictable regime. This was due partly to problems with staff retention and absence, but was also in part deliberate in the belief that lower numbers unlocked improved safety. The cost was high: managers and staff in offender management and in health care, for example, were justifiably frustrated that their services could not be delivered properly because of the restrictions. **Garth**

Working in partnership

Leaders continued to collaborate with key partners in health, education and facilities management. In most prisons, these relationships were positive but this did not always lead to good outcomes for prisoners. At Lewes, poor performance by key partners was an ongoing challenge because they lacked consistent leadership and had recruitment difficulties. At Elmley, much-needed progress in education and work and in health was also hindered by vacancies in key roles. In contrast, there were positive partnership arrangements at Leeds and Guys Marsh, and some leaders were active in developing community links.

Leaders continued to build strong partnerships with organisations in the community. Most notably, one of the senior team worked in the Mayor's office two days a week which was leading to tangible benefits in the prison, such as matched funding for a new workshop to deliver modern employment opportunities, for example, coding and call centre work. **Liverpool**

Creating the right culture

Weaknesses within leadership teams, significant staff shortfalls and a poor regime provision made it very challenging for prisons to create or maintain a positive and engaging culture that supported prisoner rehabilitation. The availability, experience and visibility of leaders at all levels affected the quality of attitudes and behaviours of staff and outcomes for prisoners.

Leaders were employing various methods to improve staff well-being to reduce the high number of resignations. However, this was undermined by a lack of supportive and visible leadership in frontline areas. This was needed to raise standards and to role model appropriate attitudes and behaviour, as well as understand fully the experiences of staff and prisoners. **Bullingdon**

However, there were some positive exceptions.

Leaders had created a culture that was positive and supported their staff to deliver countless examples of innovative and creative work. Excellent leadership from middle managers across the prison, including the various specialist units, security and safer custody, enabled some prisoners to flourish. **Parc**

In our independent reviews of progress during the year, we were encouraged to find that leaders in some prisons, including Chelmsford and Winchester, were making good progress in addressing some of the concerns we had raised during our full inspections. However, in Swaleside and Rochester not enough was being done to give confidence that outcomes were likely to improve.

Three


Men in prison



The findings from adult male prison inspections reported in the following section are based on the fifth edition of our **Expectations: Criteria for assessing the treatment of and conditions for men in prisons**, published in July 2017.


During our full inspections in 2022–23, we visited 36 prisons and young offender institutions (YOIs) holding adult and young adult men and made 148 healthy prison assessments. As Winchester prison had both a local and a category C site, it received two separate healthy prison assessments.

Figure 1: Published prisoner outcomes for all prisons and YOIs holding adult and young adult men (37)



We have compared the outcomes for the prisons we reported on in 2022–23 with the outcomes we reported the previous time we inspected the same establishments (Figure 2). Details for each healthy prison assessment area are also shown in the tables on safety (page 43), respect (page 57), purposeful activity (page 78), and rehabilitation and release planning (page 93).

Figure 2: Healthy prison assessment area changes from previous inspection, for all prisons and YOIs holding adult and young adult men



Number of healthy prison assessments declined/unchanged/improved

- Declined
- Unchanged
- Improved

Safety

Violence remained a problem with little support to improve prisoner behaviour

- Weaknesses in measures to prevent suicide and self-harm remained in over half the prisons we inspected.
- We judged that violence was still too high in over two-thirds of the prisons.
- The use of force had reduced.
- Poor time out of cell and extremely limited regimes did little to motivate prisoners to behave and progress.
- There continued to be poor conditions and a limited regime in segregation units, but relationships between staff and prisoners were often good.
- Leaders had invested in technology to reduce the supply of drugs, but poor regimes and a lack of key work and effective offender management had done little to reduce the demand.

Table 1: Safety outcomes in establishments holding adult and young adult men

	Good	Reasonably good	Not sufficiently good	Poor
Local prisons	0	3	9	2
Training prisons	1	12	8	0
Open prisons	1	0	0	0
High secure prisons	0	1	0	0
All men's prisons	2	16	17	2

Outcome of previous recommendations

In the adult male prisons reported on in 2022–23, 47% of our previous main/key concern recommendations in the area of safety had been achieved, 16% partially achieved and 38% not achieved.

Concerns for prisoners in their early days

Prisoners are particularly vulnerable during their early days in custody, so we remained concerned that first night safety interviews were still not held in private in around one-fifth of prisons; this made it less likely that vulnerable prisoners would disclose important information. The increasing use of body scanners in reception was an effective and relatively unobtrusive way to search new arrivals. However, in just over one-third of prisons inspected, staff also conducted a full strip search as a matter of routine, without assessment of individual risk or regular review to assess whether this was necessary.

Peer support in the early days of custody was a much-valued and effective way to reassure new prisoners and communicate key information, although not always a feature of reception or induction procedures.

Insiders spoke to all new prisoners and accompanied them to the induction wing. Support from them was excellent on both wings and they could be easily identified by their bright yellow T-shirts. **Doncaster**

In over two-thirds of prisons we inspected, prisoners spent their first few days in cells that were bleak, grubby and unwelcoming, and their induction into prison life was often poor. At Exeter, they experienced long delays in gaining approval for the telephone numbers they could call, leaving them unable to contact their families for many days.

The prison induction was weak and not all prisoners received it. We spoke to many new prisoners who did not know how to use the electronic kiosks [to access services] or resolve everyday queries. Prisoners experienced a poor regime during their first week with up to 22 hours a day locked up. **Nottingham**

Safeguarding

In the year ending December 2022, recorded self-harm incidents per 1,000 prisoners were down by 9% in male establishments compared with the previous 12 months. In the year ending March 2023, there were 78 self-inflicted deaths in the male estate, similar to the 77 in the previous 12 months. We were particularly concerned about the high number of self-inflicted deaths at Leeds: eight since our previous inspection.

At more than half the adult men's establishments we inspected this year, we highlighted weaknesses in measures to prevent suicide and self-harm, including poor oversight and a lack of planning to improve outcomes. At some prisons there was insufficient analysis of data to understand the main causes of self-harm, and at others, serious incidents were not systematically investigated to learn the lessons.

Prisoners repeatedly told us that the frustration and anxiety caused by long periods locked up, and a lack of purposeful activity and interventions, contributed to self-harm. The poor regime also limited the quality of relationships between staff and vulnerable prisoners; in our survey, only 45% of prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management said that they felt cared for by staff.

Most prisoners we spoke to who were on an ACCT said that interactions with staff were often cursory and that they did not feel supported or cared for. **Lewes**

We frequently reported on a poor use of the ACCT process for those at risk of suicide or self-harm, with problems including a failure to identify risks and triggers, gaps in care plans and a lack of meaningful recorded observations by staff. This meant the system was not always effective in providing adequate support for prisoners in crisis. However, at Bedford a new system was having a positive effect, with better outcomes.

Bedford had appointed three members of staff to act as single case managers for all ACCTs. These officers had a comprehensive knowledge of their cases and this made it more likely that they could provide consistent and good quality care to vulnerable prisoners. **Bedford**

In our survey, only 38% of prisoners told us that it was easy to speak to a Listener (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners). At about half of prisons, we were critical of how they were running the scheme, finding that staff often failed to unlock Listeners when prisoners requested them, and that when they were unlocked there was no designated space for them to meet.

The Listener scheme... was ineffective. Listeners were not called out at night even if a prisoner requested their help. Many staff we spoke to believed the Samaritans freephone sufficed and could not identify the benefits of face-to-face peer support for prisoners in crisis. The lack of Listener suites meant that even if they were requested (day or night) there was nowhere suitable for them to go. **Leeds**

A small number of prisons had been active and innovative in their efforts to reduce self-harm. At Doncaster, leaders had developed an effective toolkit, including a theory-based programme and plans devised by psychologists, which had been effective in reducing harm.

Procedures to identify and protect the most vulnerable prisoners at risk of harm, abuse and neglect were still no more than adequate in most prisons. Links to local safeguarding adults boards were often weak and most staff were unfamiliar with these safeguarding procedures.

Violence linked to lack of activity and support

In the year ending December 2022, the rate of violence overall was up by 3% in male establishments compared with the previous 12 months. We judged that violence remained too high in over two-thirds of the prisons we inspected. This was usually attributable to the frustrations caused by long periods locked up, a lack of purposeful activity and staff shortages that left many prisoners without the support and help they needed to progress.

Table 2: Prisoner perceptions of safety

	Have you ever felt unsafe here?
Local prisons	51%
Training prisons	41%
Open prisons	24%
High secure prisons	55%
All men's prisons	45%

All prisons were now using challenge, support, and intervention plans (CSIPs, see Glossary) to manage prisoners who presented a risk of violence. The quality of investigation into incidents and access to suitable interventions continued to vary greatly, with investigations inadequate in some prisons. We saw much more effective use of CSIP at Forest Bank, Berwyn and Ranby.

The CSIP process was well embedded, and prisoners were offered support from the accredited programmes' team thorough one-to-one sessions or in-cell work, which was a positive initiative. **Forest Bank**

At Coldingley, The Mount and Winchester, voluntary organisations were actively involved in efforts to reduce violence through interventions including mediation and conflict resolution. At our independent review of progress (IRP) at Swinfen Hall, we highlighted good use of peer support to inspire prisoners and prevent future violence. However, support for victims of violence was not good enough in most prisons.

While prisons continued to gather extensive data on safety, too few used them effectively to develop plans and improve outcomes. There were notable exceptions at Ranby and Leeds.

Leaders used data well and had a good understanding of the causes of violence. A well-attended monthly safety meeting discussed a range of data and a comprehensive action plan was regularly reviewed to monitor progress made. It contained relevant actions that supported the strategic vision. **Leeds**

Encouraging positive behaviour

We repeatedly reported that poor time out of cell and impoverished regimes did little to motivate prisoners, and there was not much opportunity for them to demonstrate improvements in behaviour and reduction in risk. Prison incentives schemes offered little distinction between the reward levels and were not effective.

There was not enough imagination and thought about what worked to encourage prisoners to behave, and the culture in many prisons was not motivational. In our survey, only 41% of prisoners said the incentives or rewards encouraged them to behave well, and only 32% felt they had been treated fairly in the behaviour management scheme.

We frequently reported a staff tolerance of low-level bad behaviour, and standards of discipline were not always set sufficiently high.

During the inspection, we saw low-level poor behaviour going unchallenged on many occasions – for example, prisoners being improperly dressed, vaping in communal areas, shouting and swearing. Some prisoners told us that they felt intimidated by this behaviour and wanted staff to do more to manage it. **Wayland**

We did report on some encouraging exceptions in prisons where leaders had been more creative in their efforts to improve behaviour. There were positive indications of improvement at Bedford through use of an ‘active citizenship’ scheme, which encouraged prisoners to make positive contributions to the prison community. At Portland and Northumberland, good consultation, facilities for independent living and innovative rewards were effective motivators.

Too many disciplinary hearings continued to be delayed, ran out of time or ended up being dismissed for technical reasons. This undermined any deterrent effect and meant that some offences went unpunished.

Use of force had reduced

The use of force had reduced in about two-thirds of prisons we inspected. The use of special accommodation (see Glossary) was also down.

Oversight and governance arrangements varied greatly. There was poor staff use of body-worn video cameras to record incidents of force in 12 prisons inspected. We reported higher levels of force than were necessary and some bad language by officers towards prisoners at Garth. We criticised the inadequate enquiry into reasons for force at Nottingham, and found poor oversight at Northumberland and Forest Bank. In contrast, oversight was effective elsewhere.

Scrutiny of the use of force was excellent and there had been major improvements in monitoring and assurance. Documentation was up to date and the quality of incident report writing was good.

Channings Wood

In seven IRPs that reviewed work to safeguard the use of force, all but one had shown good progress in addressing the concerns we raised.

Little for prisoners in segregation, but good staff relations

The regime for segregated prisoners remained too limited. For most, their day consisted of a shower, 30 minutes of exercise and a telephone call. Three prisons had made improvements by providing in-cell learning supported by education staff, but most prisoners had no opportunity to engage in activities off the unit.

Too often we found drab cells with little furniture and missing toilet seats, and in five segregation units inspected, there was no in-cell electricity.

Despite poor conditions and a limited regime, relationships between staff and prisoners were often good. We highlighted good practice at Elmley, where the mother of a prisoner was invited to a segregation review to help staff understand his needs. At Liverpool, staff had learned some Spanish so they could interact with a prisoner, which resulted in a considerable improvement in his behaviour.

Reintegration planning had improved in prisons that focused on the individual needs of prisoners and secured support from mental health and psychology teams.

There was an excellent multi-agency approach to working with prisoners on the care and separation unit (CSU) to improve their communication skills and develop prosocial coping strategies. **Berwyn**

However, too often there was no constructive work to reintegrate prisoners and plans were too generic to be effective.

Security

Most prisons had a good understanding of their main security threats and benefited from major investment in technology, such as body scanners and airport-style security systems, to tackle the entry of illicit articles and combat staff corruption. Despite this, the availability of drugs and mobile phones continued to be a significant problem that led to prisoner debt and violence. While leaders had focused on stopping drugs getting into prisons, poor regimes, inadequate interventions, and a lack of key work and effective offender management did little to reduce the demand for drugs.

Inspecting separation centres

The separation centre model was introduced in 2017 as part of the government's response to a review into the management of extremism within the prison estate. We inspected the two separation centres at Frankland and Woodhill in April 2022 and judged that outcomes for prisoners were good in safety and management of the centres, reasonably good in our respect test, but not sufficiently good in progression opportunities for those held in the centres.

Chief Inspector Charlie Taylor noted that the central team and prison leaders needed to be clear about the psychological and philosophical expectations of the centres, and make sure that all staff fully understood and delivered their specialist role.

'The challenge for the centres is to fulfil their aim in protecting others from harm while providing clear progression pathways for men to follow', he said.

'For those who fully engage and show progression, carefully organised and supervised opportunities to have some limited contact with mainstream prisoners and staff would be a way of testing whether further reintegration is possible and safe'.

Respect

Decent conditions slow to recover

- We saw some very positive relationships between staff and prisoners, but the severe lack of officers in some prisons affected this enormously and good quality key work had been too slow to be re-established. Staff-prisoner relationships were also constrained by the continuing lack of time out of cell at many prisons despite the ending of COVID-19 restrictions.
- Overcrowding was still a feature at many prisons and living conditions needed major improvement at some sites; prisons that had invested in improving decency and cleanliness showed positive change.
- Work to promote fair treatment for all groups had been slow to resume, and progress was also hampered by a lack of dedicated staff resource at some prisons.
- There had been a delay in the resumption of corporate worship in most prisons.
- Health staff continued to strive to provide services, but these were affected by vacancies and the lack of prison staff and prisoner time to attend appointments.
- There were continuing delays for prisoners to access mental health services and sometimes an over-reliance on drugs rather than therapeutic support. Shortages of pharmacy staff had led to some unsafe practices in medicines management.

Table 3: Respect outcomes in establishments holding adult and young adult men

	Good	Reasonably good	Not sufficiently good	Poor
Local prisons	1	7	6	0
Training prisons	1	14	5	1
Open prisons	0	1	0	0
High secure prisons	0	1	0	0
Total	2	23	11	1

Outcome of previous recommendations

In the adult male prisons reported on in 2022–23, 33% of our previous main/key concern recommendations in the area of respect had been achieved, 13% partially achieved and 54% not achieved.

The impact of staff shortages

Throughout the year, we raised priority concerns about the impact of severe staff shortages on outcomes for prisoners, compounded by the limited experience of some officers in working outside of COVID-19 restricted regimes. Chronic staff shortages at Winchester and Swaleside had negatively affected almost every aspect of prison life, including relationships with staff. The building of supportive relationships was also hampered at many prisons by the slow return to a fuller daily regime, which meant that prisoners continued to spend much of the day locked in their cell.

Table 4: Talking with staff

	In the last week, has any member of staff talked to you about how you are getting on?	If you wanted to, can you talk to managers, governors or directors in this prison?
Local prisons	33%	23%
Training prisons	29%	25%
Open prisons	44%	63%
High secure prisons	40%	26%
All men's prisons	31%	25%

Some governors had introduced initiatives to support and develop staff skills and confidence.

Support was given to new staff, especially through a recent increase in the number of supervising officers on the wings. This improved confidence and teamworking, particularly in maintaining order and motivating prisoners to go to workplaces. **Guys Marsh**

Key work sessions (see Glossary) were gradually being reintroduced, but most prisons were slow to restore them. Even if delivered, sessions often involved little more than basic welfare checks rather than a meaningful focus on helping the prisoner to progress and achieve sentence plan targets.

We reported on some positive examples of staff dealing skilfully with very difficult behaviours, such as at Lewes and Winchester. But although we saw improvements in the supervision and control of prisoners at some establishments, elsewhere staff failure to challenge low-level poor behaviour was a persistent weakness.

In some prisons, prisoner peer workers were used well to support fellow prisoners and develop skills.

Leaders were committed to using and developing peer support across the prison. There was a range of peer workers, including User Voice peers, who gathered views and represented others on the council... Insiders, prisoners who introduce new arrivals to prison life, and Shannon Trust mentors, who helped others with literacy. **Northumberland**

Poor living conditions

We repeatedly raised concerns about poor living conditions and the use of cells designed for one which were holding two prisoners. These cells were cramped, often had insufficient furniture and lacked privacy. Wandsworth continued to provide some of the poorest accommodation, and at Pentonville we found prisoners occupying cells that were recorded as out of use due to faults or damage. In-cell toilets were often in a poor condition with inadequate screening, lack of a seat or lid, and some were very dirty and scaled.

Many of the cells on A and C wings were not fit for occupation. Conditions were particularly poor in cells designed for one prisoner, which were holding two. There was not enough space for two people, the screening of toilets was inadequate and bunk beds were too small and in poor condition. Many cells had continuing problems with cockroaches. **Bedford**

There had been some investment across the estate to improve living conditions in many of the older prisons. HMPPS's 'clean and decent' project (see Glossary) had driven some initial improvements and, although the project and the associated finance and staffing were usually time-bound, some governors had continued the initiative within existing budgets.

Communal areas were generally reasonably maintained, although we found some landings in an appalling state during our inspection at Winchester in February 2022 – conditions were much improved during our IRP in November 2022. Communal showers were too often dirty, shabby and damp.

Weaknesses in prisoner consultation, applications and redress

Leaders did not use formal consultation consistently to address prisoner issues and make meaningful changes. While consultation forums were effective in some prisons, others were poorly attended, often did not share outcomes widely and resulted in little active change.

Many prisoners were frustrated by weaknesses in the applications and complaints processes. For example, our inspections showed that electronic kiosks – where prisoners could make direct applications for many services, including choosing meals and making shop orders – had replaced paper applications at some prisons, but this had not always remedied the persistence of late, missing or inadequate replies. Management oversight of the applications system was often far too limited to be effective.

In our survey, only 29% of prisoners who had made a complaint said that they were dealt with fairly. Complaints were returned unanswered at some prisons, and the

reason for this was not always defensible. Some leaders, including at Channings Wood, The Mount and Wealstun, used complaints data to identify areas where processes and outcomes could be improved, but others did not.

Limitations in food and shop provision

In our survey, only 41% of prisoners said the quality of food was good. As in previous years, we often found meals served far too early. This was usually because of continued restrictions on the number of prisoners who could be unlocked at a time, which meant that it took longer to serve everybody.

Most kitchens were in reasonable condition, although we routinely found that some appliances had been out of action for long periods. Most establishments operated a pre-select, four-week menu that included healthy options and catered for religious and cultural needs. The supervision and cleanliness of some residential wing serveries were poor, some food trollies were filthy, and vermin were evident in the servery at Winchester.

Some newly arrived prisoners still had to wait far too long to receive their first order from the prison shop, which left them vulnerable to getting into debt. To offset this, some prisons had provided very basic and essential items in addition to basic grocery and vape packs on arrival. Prison wages had not kept pace with the rise in the cost of goods and prisoners frequently complained about this.

Equality work slow to restart

Work to promote fair treatment of prisoners from different groups had been slow to resume following COVID-19 restrictions, which had limited the support available, but progress was also hampered by a lack of dedicated resources in some prisons. Most prisons had designated a manager as the equality lead, but some still made this an additional task for already busy managers, which often limited the attention given to this area. To support the equality lead, several prisons had allocated individual senior managers to be responsible for one of the protected characteristics (see Glossary), but this had often not led to evidence of any meaningful progress.

There was limited consultation with prisoners who shared protected characteristics and only a couple of prisons had scheduled forums that were frequent and meaningful. However, the use of prisoner equality representatives to support their peers was generally good, and we often found enthusiastic mentors who understood their role and had sufficient oversight from a manager to promote consultation, provide advice or help their peers.

Nearly all spurs had equality peer support and one house block had a Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) rep. The reps were clear about their roles, enthusiastic, felt supported and had regular meetings with the equality team. **Isis**

Few prisons had an up-to-date action plan to promote fair treatment, and although management meetings to provide scrutiny had resumed, the poor use of data failed to help leaders evidence areas of weakness or improvement. Data on equality outcomes were sometimes limited to only a few areas of prison life, and we frequently found little evidence of action to make improvements, even when they showed disproportionate outcomes for specific groups of prisoners.

While data identifying areas of disproportionality were presented, there was not enough analysis or action to address unequal treatment effectively... Over-representation of black and minority ethnic prisoners in adjudications had not been identified or investigated by leaders and managers. **Brixton**

The management of discrimination complaints was inconsistent, with responses often late or not addressing the issues raised. In some prisons, allegations of discrimination were not recorded as such and instead dealt with as general complaints, masking the true scale of the issues. Responses to discrimination reports tended to be better where the prison had commissioned quality assurance from an external or independent body.

The lack of consultation with minority ethnic prisoners meant that, at many establishments, they reported feeling that little was being done to address disproportionality or perceptions of unfair outcomes. Some establishments were unable to demonstrate how they were addressing these issues, but we did see some examples of positive practice. At The Mount, an external organisation had been facilitating consultation with black and minority ethnic prisoners; Bedford displayed equality data to help address concerns about unequal treatment; and Wayland had designed cultural awareness training for staff.

Poor deal for black prisoners

Divisions between black prisoners and white prison staff are entrenched throughout the prison service, according to the HMI Prison's thematic review, **The experiences of adult black male prisoners and black prison staff**, published in December 2022.

While inspectors found evidence of direct, explicit racism, black prisoners and black prison staff told us that subtle and insidious racism affected them more and that this was widespread and persistent. The review, based on interviews with 100 black male prisoners, 27 black prison staff, 17 senior managers and 39 other prison staff, found that disproportionality, such as in the use of force, and ineffective systems aimed at addressing discrimination were persistent issues that negatively impacted on black prisoners' experiences of custody.

Commenting on the findings, Chief Inspector Charlie Taylor said: 'Our report proposes a number of solutions developed in discussion with both black prisoners and prison staff that focus on creating opportunities for respectful communication and the development of mutual understanding... we believe they have the potential to be transformative if the prison service is prepared to take them seriously'.

Prisoners from Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities told us that they sometimes felt overlooked by prison staff. However, at establishments such as Wayland and Featherstone, where there had been dedicated consultation with these prisoners, outcomes were better and some issues were being addressed.

Some prisons we visited had high numbers of foreign national prisoners, including those held under immigration powers who had finished serving their sentence. For example, foreign nationals made up 45% of prisoners at Wandsworth and 23% at Pentonville. Professional interpreting services were not used enough in many establishments to communicate with prisoners, including, worryingly, Maidstone, which held only foreign nationals. Although Home Office staff had now returned to working in prisons, many foreign national prisoners continued to tell us that they felt confused and helpless about their immigration status. A short thematic review on the experience of immigration detainees, published in October 2022, highlighted the prevalence of these problems and their negative impact (see page 140).

It was nonetheless positive that some establishments, including Nottingham, Isis and Pentonville, were providing targeted support, including foreign national prisoner representatives, support from external organisations, and additional phone credit to keep in touch with family and friends overseas.

Some prisons did not have enough adapted cells for physically disabled prisoners or used cells that were in a poor condition. While most prisons used personal emergency evacuation plans, they were not always of a high quality and we found documentation that was out of date or inadequately detailed, and instances where staff were unaware of which prisoners required support. Many prisons continued to use peer support workers to assist prisoners with disabilities. This was positive, but we saw some concerning instances, for example at Garth, of peer workers with insufficient training and oversight, or who were providing inappropriate personal care.

Some prisons had appointed lead managers or established multidisciplinary committees focused on improving support for prisoners with neurodivergent needs. At Bullingdon, the neurodiversity lead reviewed use of force footage in order to offer advice to staff about how to de-escalate situations.

Little had been done at some prisons to understand young adults' needs and make specific provision for them and there was often slow progress to address disproportionate outcomes for this group. However, there had been some initiatives, such as a young adults unit at Parc, a specific course for young adults at Pentonville, young adult ambassadors to advocate for their peers at Bedford and a youth engagement worker at Exeter.

The prison had prioritised consistent key work for young adults, and leaders had recently worked with an outside organisation which carried out some consultation with them. In addition, the non-accredited course, ‘Timewise’, was delivered to young adults between the ages of 21 and 25 with a history of violence in custody. This course... was a good initiative. **Ranby**

We found some good provision for older prisoners – such as separate residential units, specialist gym sessions and day centres at Brixton and Northumberland. However, at many establishments, support was underdeveloped or was yet to resume following the pandemic.

Support for LGBT prisoners was often lacking, with many establishments offering no formal consultation or links with community organisations. Some establishments had been more proactive and this had led to positive outcomes – at Doncaster, following consultation with LGBT prisoners, greetings cards for prisoners in same-sex relationships were now available from the prison shop.

Transgender prisoners continued to experience varying levels of care, but we mostly found them receiving at least some tailored support, including case management boards. We also saw some good practice, including transgender prisoners accessing health care equivalent to that in the community in Liverpool, and being able to purchase suitable cosmetics and clothing at Forest Bank.

Delays in resumption of faith services

Work to encourage prisoners to practise their religion had been slow to recover, with a delay in the resumption of corporate worship in most prisons. Many continued to limit the number of prisoners who could attend each service, meaning they could often only attend once every few weeks. In most cases, this was because there were not enough staff to escort prisoners to services. However, in our survey, 70% of prisoners who had a religion said they were able to attend religious services if they wanted.

Many prisons had vacancies for chaplains, some of which were long-standing. Despite this, we found that almost all chaplaincies went beyond their statutory duties and offered a wide range of pastoral support, including bereavement counselling.

Yoga sessions were provided through the chaplaincy for staff and prisoners; the Urban Beats music project had continued throughout the pandemic; and the Sycamore Tree victim awareness programme had restarted with a new volunteer team. **Guys Marsh**

Health, well-being and social care

Staffing pressures had had a major impact on the delivery of safe and effective health provision across all disciplines, considerably testing staff resilience in many prisons; their dedication was admirable despite the pressures. Staffing was adapted to make sure that prisoners were seen despite reduced access; this included outreach working on the wings and frequent cross-deployment between specialities. The reduced number of health appointments created by high staff vacancy rates was exacerbated by a dearth of prison officers and continued restrictions to time out of cell, which reduced prisoner access to appointments both within and outside the prison.

An appropriate range of primary care services was available. However, waiting times were often too long, and between September and October 2022, 47 primary care clinics had been cancelled. **Wakefield**

Prisons with a more stable staff group still struggled to fill specialist posts, particularly psychologists and pharmacists. We found unmet needs at many sites, with our Care Quality Commission (CQC) partners initiating regulatory action at 15 of the 36 adult male prisons; governance, poor medicines management and low staffing generated most concerns.

We saw a marked improvement in emergency response care this year, which was positive following the historic repeated recommendations from the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman death in custody inquiries. We saw some emerging quality improvements at Guys Marsh, where the prison trained custody officers in immediate life support, the equivalent to first responders in the community.

Delays in mental health services

This year, many mental health patients faced lengthy delays or were unable to access some treatments for their conditions, most notably in psychologically based therapies. In some cases, this led to an over-reliance on pharmacological treatments, which prevented the patient addressing underlying trauma and improving health outcomes.

Counselling and psychologist-led therapies were not delivered and staff relied heavily on prescribing, which was inappropriate. About a fifth of the population were prescribed an anti-depressant with a sedating effect, which was far higher than the general population. The needs of patients with mental health conditions such as depression and anxiety were not being met and there were no plans to address this. **Parc**

Despite these challenges, access for prisoners requiring urgent intervention was resilient and active, and there was a good focus on their early days in custody. Discharge arrangements were effective and the coordination of post-release support was generally managed well.

Disappointingly, mental health training for prison officers remained far too fragmented and, in some prisons, non-existent.

We continued to be very concerned by the plight of mentally unwell prisoners waiting protracted times for transfer to specialist mental health inpatient facilities for treatment under the Mental Health Act. All too often, those in mental health crisis were held in conditions that were clearly detrimental to their health and well-being, usually in segregation or inpatient units. However, despite all the ongoing challenges, staff at Pentonville had prioritised a positive therapeutic input with a well-being unit providing daily activities for patients.

Substance misuse

Despite staffing pressures, the availability and quality of clinical treatment and psychological support for prisoners misusing substances had remained strong, although access to trained peer support, group work and mutual aid such as Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous was more variable.

An important development this year was the piloting of a long-acting intramuscular opiate substitution treatment in several prisons, such as Lancaster Farms and Northumberland. This curtailed the need to take daily oral medicines for some patients, with obvious potential benefits that we will continue to monitor.

Medicines management

Just over half the adult male prisons we inspected this year had maintained reasonably good or good oversight of medicines. This was generally evident when there was a pharmacist actively involved, and robust monitoring of prescribing and the management of medicines by an effective medicines management committee that met regularly.

However, we saw an increase in unsafe practices due to staff shortages in the pharmacy teams and a lack of robust governance. This created risks in the safe handling and storage of medicines, and led to delays in patients receiving their medication, some of which were critical.

Officer supervision of medicine queues was often inconsistent, which increased the risks of medication being diverted to others for whom it was not prescribed. We saw the unsafe transportation of medicines in several prisons, including health staff transposing medicines to small pots, carrying drugs in unlocked boxes and transporting them through unsafe areas; at some prisons, this was linked to adverse incidents.

The safety of health staff while transporting controlled drugs around the prison had sometimes been compromised by prison staff allowing prisoners along the route. There was insufficient officer support and management of medicine queues to promote patient confidentiality, lessen the opportunities for diversion and bullying, and support safe medicine administration. **Wayland**

Many health services were also now accessing the national Reconnect pathway (see Glossary) designed to improve health outcomes for vulnerable individuals released from prison, and which fostered more effective partnerships and improved through-the-gate support.

Purposeful activity

Too many locked in their cells for too long, and too few activities offered

- The pace of recovery in prisoner access to purposeful activity was far too slow once pandemic restrictions had been lifted. Many prisoners were still locked up for around 22 hours a day and had considerably less time out of cell than at previous inspections. They spent even more time locked up at weekends.
- Access to the library was still far too limited in many prisons. Although more prisoners could go to the gym, this was often restricted because of staff shortages.
- A lack of education, training and work continued to disadvantage prisoners. They had too few opportunities to improve their English, reading and mathematics skills and take accredited qualifications that would help with employment on release.
- The quality of prison education in men's prisons had deteriorated even further. In England Ofsted judged the 'overall effectiveness' of provision to be 'inadequate' in 60% and 'requires improvement' in 40% of men's prisons they inspected with us. In Wales, Estyn assessed standards in both men's prisons they inspected with us – Parc and Berwyn – as 'good'.
- Still not enough was being done to teach prisoners to learn to read or improve their reading.

Table 5: Purposeful activity outcomes in establishments holding adult and young adult men

	Good	Reasonably good	Not sufficiently good	Poor
Local prisons	0	0	6	8
Training prisons	1	0	9	11
Open prisons	0	0	1	0
High secure prisons	0	0	1	0
All men's prisons	1	0	17	19

Outcome of previous recommendations


In the adult male prisons reported on in 2022–23, 17% of our previous main/key concern recommendations in the area of purposeful activity had been achieved, 15% partially achieved and 68% not achieved.

Locked up for too long even after restrictions lifted

The time prisoners spent unlocked was still severely limited in closed prisons, despite the lifting of pandemic restrictions in May 2022.

In our survey, 42% of prisoners said they were in their cells for more than 22 hours a day on weekdays and at the weekends this was even worse (see ‘Weekends spent in cells’, page 81). Considerably more prisoners spent an excessive time locked up compared with the year before the pandemic.

Figure 3: Time out of cell – percentage who responded that they usually spent less than two hours unlocked on a weekday and weekend in men’s prisons*



*Figures from HMI Prisons annual reports since 2018-19

Weekends spent in cells

In 2022–23, 60% of all male prisoners surveyed told us that they spent less than two hours out of their cell on a typical Saturday or Sunday, compared with 28% in the year before the pandemic.

To find out more about the experience of prisoners at weekends, we carried out unannounced day-long visits over the weekend to 11 adult prisons in England and Wales in early 2023. We found an impoverished regime operating in most prisons at weekends, and highlighted the toll on prisoners' mental health and well-being from being locked up for such prolonged periods.

In 10 of the 11 prisons, most prisoners could expect to be out of their cells for a maximum of 2.5 hours a day. In the worst cases, they received only 45 minutes to an hour unlocked each day, and, in one prison, were not unlocked at all for one of the two days except to collect their meals.

Prisoners told us of their frustration at not having enough time to complete basic daily tasks or take exercise in the fresh air. Even when they were unlocked for association, they spoke of chronic boredom as there was not enough for them to do.

Many prisoners were locked up for far too long. Almost two-thirds of the population were locked up during the day at Forest Bank and Norwich. Prisoners at Bullingdon were often in their cell for 23 hours a day

and at Garth they were frequently kept locked up because there were not enough prison officers.

Unlocking prisoners only in small groups – a practice introduced to reduce the spread of COVID-19 – persisted in many prisons. Prisoners were unlocked for a short time in small cohorts at Pentonville and Isis because of tensions between gang members. Often prisoners were unlocked later, or locked up earlier, than published times at Exeter and Wayland.

Prisoners allocated to an activity had more time out of their cell, at around five hours a day for part-time workers in Portland and seven hours for those with jobs in Northumberland. Too many prisoners, though, were unemployed, and locked up for 23 hours a day.

The regime for unemployed prisoners was poor with most only receiving one hour a day out of cell. For some prisoners this lack of time out of cell for many months was having a detrimental impact on their emotional well-being. **Leeds**

Too many prisons had switched from full- to part-time activities for prisoners. This reduced both time unlocked and opportunities to learn new skills at category C training prisons, such as Ranby, Onley and Featherstone.

Even as the year progressed, we found prisoners still spending far too long locked up. Only two of our 11

independent review visits that followed up a concern at the lack of time out of cell found ‘reasonable progress’.

Evening association had not been reintroduced in many prisons, although most prisoners at Parc had one to two hours of association in the evenings, which was valued.

Many prisons did not allow prisoners sufficient time in the fresh air, and some exercise yards were bleak environments. Only a minority of prisoners at Wakefield took daily exercise on the prison’s sole, small yard, and prisoners working full-time at Guys Marsh were not given time to take exercise in the open air. However, our survey showed a more positive picture (see Table 6).

We found some enrichment activities running at Lancaster Farms and youth clubs at Isis, but recreational activities were very limited elsewhere. When most prisoners were unlocked there was little for them to do. Even the use of pool and table tennis tables was prohibited at Bullingdon, and until the week of our inspection at Maidstone, prisoners had only been allowed to use them at weekends. At Lewes, prisoners told us of repeated tedious days with nothing to do.

Time out of cell was poor for most prisoners. There were frequent regime curtailments, attendance and punctuality at activities were poor, most prisoners could not visit the library and they had inadequate access to the gym. **Pentonville**

Limits in using the library and gym

Table 6: Access to the library, gym and exercise outdoors

	Are you able to visit the library once a week or more?	Do you typically go to the gym or play sports twice a week or more?	Could you go outside for exercise more than 5 days a week, if you wanted to?
Local prisons	35%	25%	52%
Training prisons	37%	39%	70%
Open prisons	85%	60%	94%
High secure prisons	76%	31%	77%
All men's prisons	38%	34%	63%

Libraries had been slow to reopen, and even where they had, there were often not enough officers to take prisoners to use them. Access to the library was also limited by pandemic-introduced restrictions on numbers that had still not been lifted. Only eight prisoners per session could attend the library at Lewes, and just six at a time in Elmley.

Library staff expressed their frustration at the lack of attendance from the wings... On both days that we met the [Shannon Trust reading] mentors, no prisoners had been brought from the wings, which was particularly disappointing and very frustrating for the mentors. **Ranby**

Other libraries had thrived. At Bedford, the library had stayed open throughout the pandemic, and evening library sessions introduced at Leeds had improved access. Most prisoners at Wakefield could visit the library regularly, although only for a short time, and many prisons had continued a remote library service for ordering books. Although we found enthusiastic librarians running initiatives to encourage reading, too few prisoners had adequate access to make good use of this support.

Prisoner use of the gym varied. At Guys Marsh, a good system gave fair access, and half of the prisoners in our survey there said they could attend the gym more than twice a week. Access to the

gym was also good at Nottingham and Bullingdon, but the number of prisoners able to attend at Isis and Pentonville was considerably lower.

A shortage of gym staff at The Mount, which had only three out of eight instructors, severely limited gym sessions, and at Ranby, only 7% of prisoners said they could visit the gym twice a week or more.

Not all prisoners could attend the gym every week and we were not confident that access to the gym was equitable. Many prisoners spoke to us about the lack of access to the gym and the impact this had on their well-being. **Liverpool**

We found good indoor gym facilities with a range of equipment at most inspections, but outdoor areas had deteriorated or were underused.

Most prisons were still not offering accredited PE qualifications or vocational courses, although the gym at Doncaster had delivered an impressive 326 national vocational qualifications. Several prisons had links with their local communities through the Football Association twinning project, offering prisoners a coaching qualification, and Brixton had also introduced Street Soccer and the Clink-to-Club boxing programme.

Education, skills and work – still not good enough

The return to education and training in most prisons continued to be slow. Purposeful activity was judged to be poor or not sufficiently good in all but one of the adult male prisons we inspected this year and 34% of all of our priority concerns this year were in this area.

Although all prisons had returned to some face-to-face education and work, far too few prisoners were engaged in purposeful activity. Most prisons simply did not have enough activity spaces for all prisoners, which had a substantial and detrimental impact on their access to education and work. Activities that did take place were often cancelled at short notice due to staff absences, while many workshops and activities had not reopened due to difficulties recruiting suitable tutors and instructors. The lack of purposeful activity was particularly concerning in prisons with training or resettlement functions, as prisoners struggled to gain qualifications or develop skills that would help them on release.

At some prisons, these issues were compounded because not all the places were used. At Liverpool, there were only enough places for two-thirds of the population, yet even those were not filled, while at Lewes, Ranby and Onley over half of prisoners were unemployed, even though there were spaces available in classrooms and workshops. At Wakefield, the shortfall of activity meant that some prisoners had waited

over a year to be allocated a place, and at Onley the extensive greenhouses in the market garden were falling apart and beds were overgrown with weeds.

In almost all establishments, prisoners' academic and vocational starting points, sentence plan targets or career aspirations were often not taken into account when they were allocated to an activity. At Garth, prisoners lacked motivation to attend because they were not interested in roles they felt forced into and had not chosen. At Berwyn, prisoners disrupted classes due to this discontent.

Purposeful activity spaces were usually part-time, which meant that qualifications took too long to complete, waiting lists were long and activities often did not reflect real-life working conditions. For most prisoners, part-time equated to between seven and 15 hours of activity a week; they therefore still spent too much time locked up.

As a result of the considerably restricted prison regime... [prisoners] typically spent only seven or eight hours per week at their activities. Vulnerable prisoners who studied mathematics or English received only three or four hours of face-to-face teaching per week. It took most prisoners too long to complete their courses. They often had moved to another prison or were released before they could take their exams. **Norwich**

The education, training and work on offer did not meet prisoners' needs, especially those with learning difficulties or disabilities (LDD) or who did not speak English as a first language or were nearing release. The range of opportunities was too narrow in almost all prisons, and there were too few choices for prisoners to learn English and maths skills, take accredited qualifications or study at higher levels.

Prisoners with low levels of English and maths received too little support to develop these fundamental skills, hampering their ability to improve their employability both within prison and on release, or to progress to higher level qualifications; this affected a high proportion of prisoners at Northumberland and Lewes. Meanwhile, long waiting lists for basic English and maths at the Isle of Wight and Maidstone prevented prisoners from progressing into valuable jobs around the prison, such as mentor roles.

For those with additional learning needs or mental health issues that made engaging in purposeful activity challenging, the quality of provision was highly variable. Although we commonly saw LDD needs identified during induction, tutors did not then always use this information to adapt materials or lessons to help prisoners overcome barriers to learning. However, there was better provision at Portland, where specialist staff provided one-to-one support for prisoners with LDD needs, and Chelmsford, where three specialist inclusion support co-ordinators provided valuable support to teachers.

A faith-based organisation Junction 42 provided very effective support to unemployed and the hardest-to-reach prisoners... They were encouraged to participate in group activities that included art, creative writing and music. For many prisoners, these activities had a significant impact on their ability to acknowledge and understand the impact of their negative behaviour and contributed positively to their rehabilitation, socialisation and participation in regime activities.

Northumberland

Too many prisoners in work, particularly on the wing, were underemployed. The work was not challenging, often insufficiently supervised, did not encourage prisoners to develop a good work ethic, and too few were able to progress into supervisory roles. At Wayland and Guys Marsh, prisoners were demotivated by repetitive and mundane work, and a lack of opportunity to take accredited qualifications in workshops.

However, some leaders had started to introduce broader curriculums and more ambitious options to challenge prisoners and encourage them to progress and develop their skills and knowledge. Parc – the only adult male prison where we judged purposeful activity to be good this year – provided an extensive range of education, training and employment, from basic English and maths to accredited vocational training and higher-level study. At Channings Wood, the curriculum

had been adapted to include more short courses for short-sentenced prisoners to reflect the changing population, and leaders at Rochester had made good use of funding to introduce a broad and varied curriculum.

Attendance and punctuality at work and education remained a concern. At Berwyn, Exeter and Onley, attendance was too low, staff did not do enough to encourage prisoners to attend and there were insufficient sanctions for refusing to do so. At many other prisons, prisoners were often late to their (already only part-time) activities due to delays in unlock times, a shortage of prison staff, and because the times clashed with health care appointments or gym sessions.

We found slow progress in response to the recommendations of our review of reading in prisons conducted jointly with Ofsted in 2021–22. Our call for a prison-wide reading strategy had not been implemented effectively and there was still little assessment of reading ability or classes for non-readers or emergent readers. With literacy levels worse among prisoners than in the general population, there was still not enough done for them to learn to read or improve their reading.

Overall, inspection outcomes for education, skills and work, which were already poor, were considerably worse than in recent years and had deteriorated even further.

Rehabilitation and release planning

Resource pressures affect progress for prisoners

- Too many prisons had been slow to re-establish a full programme of visits and family support, but a few provided excellent facilities.
- The Offender Management in Custody (OMiC) model (see Glossary) was not working. While specialist staff worked hard, staffing pressures and resulting high caseloads had led to little contact between offender managers and prisoners, and almost everywhere prisoners, especially those serving long sentences, were frustrated that they could not make progress. This was exacerbated by the lack of accredited courses to address offending.
- Public protection systems often worked satisfactorily, but many prisons had long backlogs in monitoring the phone calls and mail of individuals posing potential risks.
- Leaders were still struggling with the impact of the changes to probation services in 2021, which had led to fewer staff helping prisoners with practical resettlement needs. The handover of cases from prison staff to community probation staff well in advance of release was often inadequate. There were some good practical innovations in supporting prisoners on their release, but far too many were not released to suitable accommodation.

Table 7: Rehabilitation and release planning outcomes in establishments holding adult and young adult men

	Good	Reasonably good	Not sufficiently good	Poor
Local prisons	1	7	6	0
Training prisons	0	6	11	4
Open prisons	0	1	0	0
High secure prisons	0	1	0	0
All men's prisons	1	15	17	4

Outcome of previous recommendations

In the adult male prisons reported on in 2022–23, 26% of our previous main/key concern recommendations in the area of rehabilitation and release planning had been achieved, 10% partially achieved and 64% not achieved.

Prisons slow to rebuild family links

In-person social visits were now taking place consistently and, in our survey, 24% of prisoners said they had been able to see family/friends in person at least once in the last month. The easing of restrictions on physical contact and the reopening of some children's play facilities had improved the overall experience for many prisoners and their families. However, at too many prisons visits were capped at a lower number than before the pandemic for no clear reason. At Guys Marsh and Ranby, for example, provision was insufficient to meet demand. In some prisons, the booking systems were inefficient, slow and frustrating for visitors.

The number of visits allowed also varied. At Berwyn, remand prisoners could have three visits a week, but at Nottingham they were restricted to only three a month. Those on the enhanced incentives level at Elmley could have six visits a month, but at Wayland they could only have two.

The help available to prisoners to establish, build and maintain relationships with their children and families varied widely. It was encouraging that many of the pre-pandemic opportunities that had been suspended were gradually being reintroduced, such as family days. In some prisons, such as Parc and Doncaster, we found some excellent examples of family support work.

The ‘Families First’ team was very active... in spite of COVID-19 restrictions, its activities included ‘Daddy Newborn’, offering a supervised, well-equipped nursery room for a parent to bond with their child; relationships courses; and a ‘family album’ scheme in preparation for Mother’s Day, with the family support worker taking photographs of prisoners with their mothers. Family events had been held... and a programme of regular special events in visits was being prepared... Sensory equipment was available for use in a private room, for visitors with neurodiverse conditions. **Doncaster**

Most prisons we visited now had in-cell telephones, which were crucial in enabling family contact, and greatly appreciated by prisoners. Secure video-calling facilities (see Glossary) remained a valuable resource, but were underused at many sites.

Offender management model still falling short of expectations

The delivery of OMiC, introduced in 2018 to coordinate a prisoner’s journey through custody and back into the community, continued to fall well short of expectations. There was some good local leadership from senior probation officers who prioritised risk management and gave direction to the work of the offender management unit (OMU) at sites such as Channings Wood and Coldingley. Unfortunately, this

was too often undermined by limited key work that was rarely connected to offender management, a shortage of prison and probation offender managers, and caseloads that were often very high and increasing.

The work of the offender management unit (OMU) was significantly compromised due to an acute shortage of probation officers with only 6.7 out of 16 in post. As a result, caseloads were unmanageable at about 140 prisoners each. **Isle of Wight**

Most of our inspections found that prisoners had insufficient contact with their prison offender manager (POM). There was little chance, therefore, to build relationships or to complete assessments and sentence plans, and POMs were not able to identify changes in prisoners' behaviour. While some prisons had reduced the backlog of prisoners' offender assessment system (OASys) assessments of risk and need, some had been completed remotely with no face-to-face contact with prisoners. These issues undermined effective offender management and left many prisoners with justifiable frustrations, as they were unclear about what objectives they needed to achieve during their sentence.

Most prisoners we interviewed were frustrated by a lack of contact from the OMU and questioned its usefulness and visibility. Their contact with POMs was very inconsistent both in quality and frequency... too often we found minimal or no recorded contact.

In one case, there was no recorded contact for two years. **Featherstone**

Provision for indeterminate and long sentenced prisoners was also lacking, and at too many prisons the support previously available, including special family days and lifer forums, had not yet resumed.

Poor provision for prisoners on remand

Offender management statistics show that the remand population has grown by 50% since the COVID-19 pandemic, rising from 9,708 in December 2019 to 14,591 in March 2023. This increase was most clearly seen in seen in reception prisons inspected by HMI Prisons – for instance, the proportion of prisoners on remand or convicted but unsentenced was 30% in Lewes, 55% in Exeter, and 68% in Pentonville. In Forest Bank, where 44% of prisoners were on remand or were convicted but unsentenced, the prison was unable to accommodate the prisoners who were remanded.

The prison could not meet the demand for places, meaning many remanded prisoners and others who should have stayed at Forest Bank in the lead up to release were routinely transferred to other prisons often miles away... On the day we started the inspection, 12 remanded prisoners had to be redirected to HMP Liverpool and six went to HMP Leeds. **Forest Bank**

The rise in the remand population had also caused backlogs in the courts, increasing remand prisoners' stays in prison. For example, at Forest Bank, 90 prisoners on remand had been in the prison for over a year.

With this increased population of remand prisoners, it is important to ensure that resettlement services are still available to them. Several reception prisons had a bail information officer, which was very useful to those on remand.

... risk management arrangements were considered in advance for remanded high risk of harm prisoners who could be granted bail or, following the time spent on remand, were likely to be released immediately from court after being sentenced with no oversight in place.

Exeter

Those on remand can have pressing financial issues, especially when they are first brought to prison and when they approach release. Some prisons gave advice on rehabilitation and resettlement services for those on remand, but elsewhere reductions in resettlement teams had put remand prisoners at the back of the queue, while restructuring of provision had also disadvantaged them.

Neither the information, advice and guidance staff nor the housing support provider were contracted to work with remand prisoners, although we saw examples of Jobcentre Plus staff providing advice to

remand prisoners. While resettlement workers saw all new arrivals, including those who had not yet been sentenced, the latter received no further support, even if they had a pressing concern, such as a risk of losing their tenancy. **Belmarsh**

Pentonville had lost its finance, benefit and debt worker, although the pre-release team supported a few remand prisoners in obtaining ID and opening bank accounts, and the Jobcentre Plus team was helping with applications for benefits. Bedford was also trying to fill this gap and at Elmley, the resettlement team gave advice on claiming housing benefit to maintain a tenancy. At several prisons, such as Doncaster, Elmley and Nottingham, leaders had made efforts to provide housing advice to remand prisoners from their own resources.

Although remand prisoners are entitled to have more visits than those sentenced, not all prisons had returned to the frequency available before the pandemic, with Nottingham and Winchester offering only two or three visits a month.

Work to protect the public not always effective

Information from an individual's time in prison may be the only evidence of their recent behaviour and each prison has a duty to share what they know with the community bodies that form multi-agency public

protection arrangements (MAPPA). We found good information sharing for the minority of prisoners who were at the higher risk levels two and three, but not nearly enough in many of the cases at level one, so ongoing risks were not always identified before release.

Systems to monitor the telephones and mail of individuals assessed as posing potential risks were in disarray at too many prisons. At some establishments, such as Berwyn and Leeds, around two to three weeks had passed without staff listening to calls made by prisoners identified as posing a risk to others. This delay created potential risks to the public.

There were, however, some examples of better practice. Monitoring of prisoner communications at Forest Bank showed that, when completed effectively, the information obtained could be used to protect the public.

Work to protect the public was robust. A dedicated and skilled monitoring team listened to a high volume of calls every day with very few delays. Prison offender managers promptly shared concerns with other agencies... This good quality work had led to the identification of some safeguarding concerns for victims and their families in the community. **Forest Bank**

Continuing delays in progression prospects

There were delays in the transfer of prisoners eligible for progressive moves, and this was especially frustrating for category D prisoners waiting to move to open conditions. They told us this was often made worse by a lack of information about how long they might have to wait.

Fifty-two prisoners were waiting for a progressive move and it was clear that some would be released before being given a transfer to open conditions.

Brixton

At both category C and D sites, release on temporary licence (ROTL) was not used to full effect as a way for prisoners to demonstrate risk reduction and help with resettlement before release. For example, at Spring Hill, an open site where ROTL should be available to most prisoners, delays in completing assessments meant that too few accessed it before release.

Not enough interventions delivered

While restrictions on the provision of offending behaviour programmes had lifted, there were not yet enough interventions delivered and prisoners had limited opportunities to complete risk reduction work. A few prisons, such as Doncaster and Parc, offered a full schedule of interventions, but many were still not

reaching the level of delivery needed. Some prisons mitigated this with good in-cell work packages, but few prisoners had one-to-one support, which had been affected by staff shortages. In the prisons we visited for independent reviews of progress, staffing to deliver interventions had been made a priority, but we saw prisoners throughout the year who were still released into the community with unmet offending behaviour needs.

As prisoners were being prioritised for programmes by key milestones in their sentence, such as their parole or release date, those serving long sentences felt they could not make any progress. Transferring prisoners elsewhere to complete courses was also proving difficult. In every prison inspected this year, not enough work was done to understand the needs of the population to reduce the risk of reoffending.

Release planning poorly organised and resourced

Following the changes to probation services in 2021, resettlement planning arrangements were fragmented and prisoners' needs were not reviewed far enough ahead of their release.

In nearly all prisons, the resettlement team saw all prisoners assessed as presenting a low or medium risk of reoffending, although teams were generally much smaller than their equivalents before 2021. In some prisons that were well resourced with good partnership

links, such as Elmley, Doncaster and Channings Wood, prisoners received a good service. However, in others, such as Ranby, Wayland and Featherstone, support was not well co-ordinated and prisoners expressed concerns about their preparation for release.

The release of very high- or high-risk prisoners was managed by the community offender manager (COM), and the outcome depended on the strength of communication between the prison, COM and other agencies involved. In Berwyn, we saw evidence of effective handovers between the prison and the community, but in Ranby:

... responses and actions by COMs were not always timely. Prisoners were confused by the change of arrangements and were not always aware of what was being done to help them, and the lack of certainty generated considerable anxiety. **Ranby**

Finding accommodation, a critical component to enable other elements of release planning to be effective, was a concern for many prisoners being released. In our survey, 65% of prisoners expecting to be released in the next three months said they needed help to find accommodation, but only 34% said they were getting it. Too many prisons did not record data to show how many prisoners had been released to sustainable accommodation, and the limited data available showed some poor outcomes. In Pentonville, Brixton and

Ranby, up to half of prisoners were released to no fixed abode or their accommodation status unknown. We saw better outcomes in Parc and Channings Wood, where 85% to 89% left with suitable accommodation.

Innovative release services were being developed in some prisons, such as Leeds, Nottingham and Liverpool, including ‘employment hubs’ and/or mentoring services to support prisoners for their release. In just under a third of prisons, we found good practical arrangements for prisoners on the day of release. In several prisons, they received support through a ‘departure lounge’ arrangement, where they could collect useful essential items, such as food, toiletries and clothing, as well as talk with staff who could give advice and facilitate phone calls to community agencies.

Armed Forces custody and detention facilities


In December 2021, we inspected the HM Armed Forces five Service Custody Facilities (SCFs) in the UK, short-term custodial facilities holding service personnel pending charge or conviction for service offences. In January 2022, we inspected the Military Corrective Training Centre (MCTC) in Colchester, a facility holding service personnel who have been detained under Armed Forces law. Both inspections focused on outcomes for detainees based on our **Expectations for military detention**.

Our inspection of the five SCFs found that the treatment of detainees remained extremely good. Although the number of detainees using the facilities was low and their length of stay was short, the 14 hours a day that they spent unlocked was among the best we have seen in any of the custodial environments that we inspect.

We found a strong rehabilitative culture at the MCTC. The establishment, which held 33 men at the time of our inspection, received three ‘good’ and one ‘reasonably good’ scores against our four healthy prison tests. We were concerned, however, about legislative gaps in public protection arrangements, including for some violent offenders released at the end of their sentence without formal community supervision.

Four

Women in prison



This section reviews findings from three full inspections of women's prisons in 2022–23, at Bronzefield, Eastwood Park and New Hall, and one review of progress (IRP) at Foston Hall.

The findings are based on our **Expectations: Criteria for assessing the treatment of and conditions for women in prisons**, second edition, published in April 2021.

- Self-harm rates had increased. We were concerned about the lack of active care to prevent women getting into crisis, and the staff use of physical force to stop self-harming behaviour.
- Mental health needs were high; some prisons held women who were acutely unwell and should have been in hospital.
- Health care provision was generally good, but delivery was sometimes hindered by a lack of staff. The concerns raised by the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman over the deaths of two babies in prisons had been carefully considered and responded to appropriately.
- Living conditions were generally reasonable but some shared cells were cramped.
- Women continued to have too little time out of their cell and staff shortages often led to further curtailments.
- The quality of education, skills and work provision was good at only one of the three inspections.
- Offender management was reasonably good, but there were some weaknesses in public protection work.

- Remanded women could not always access even very basic resettlement help. Too many women left prison without a sustainable place to live.

Table 8: Prisoner outcomes in inspections of women’s prisons reported on in 2022–23

	Safety	Respect	Purposeful activity	Rehabilitation and release planning
Bronzefield	Reasonably good	Reasonably good	Reasonably good	Reasonably good
Eastwood Park	Poor	Reasonably good	Not sufficiently good	Reasonably good
New Hall	Good	Reasonably good	Not sufficiently good	Reasonably good

Outcome of previous recommendations

In the women's prisons reported on in 2022–23:

- 50% of the previous main/key concern recommendations in the areas of safety and respect had been achieved and 50% had not been achieved
- 50% of the main/key concern recommendations in the area of purposeful activity had been partially achieved and 50% had not been achieved
- in the area of resettlement, 50% of our previous main/key concern recommendations had been achieved, 25% had been partially achieved and 25% had not been achieved.

Safety

Concerns about self-harm and use of force

In our survey, 20% of women said they felt unsafe at the time of the inspection. Although this was similar to the response from men in prison, 57% of women went on to say that they had felt unsafe at some time, compared with 45% of men. Most violent incidents were not serious, but the rate at Foston Hall was the highest across all women's prisons at the time of our IRP. Self-harm rates had continued to increase considerably. For example, at Eastwood Park, the incidence had more than doubled since we last inspected in 2019. Good multidisciplinary support was provided to the most vulnerable at each site, but there was an over-reliance

on use of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management with too little attention to preventing women getting into crisis in the first place.

At each prison, we were concerned about the number of times staff had resorted to physical force to stop self-harming behaviour. With little staff use of body-worn cameras, it was difficult to evidence if it was always a proportionate or appropriate response to women in crisis.

Some segregation units were bleak, with little access for women to a meaningful regime or therapeutic support, but Foston Hall had made progress in improving conditions and had reduced its use for women who self-harmed. At other prisons, weak oversight and monitoring meant we were not always able to see justification for the prolonged segregation of a small number of women, some of whom were at risk of self-harm.

At New Hall, some women with highly complex needs lived on a designated unit that had a positive and therapeutic ethos, while in Eastwood Park, the unit to accommodate some acutely mentally unwell women was in a very poor condition and provided far too little support and care.

In our survey, 71% of women said that most staff treated them with respect and 80% that there were staff they could turn to if they had a problem. However, many told us of their frustrations with some staff who were not helpful. New Hall was committed to consistent and

high-quality key work, which helped to promote positive outcomes, but at other sites it was less well delivered.

The reception area at each prison was welcoming and arrival processes were thorough. At Bronzefield, peer workers were used very well to provide ongoing support, which included staying in touch with women for their first 20 days at the prison. Foston Hall had made progress in addressing our concerns about new arrivals, including more robust safety interviews.

We continued to find remanded and recalled women held in prison for ‘their own protection’ as well as other women who were in prison as a ‘place of safety’ while waiting for an assessment under the Mental Health Act, who could have been cared for in a community setting.

The prison was collecting useful data on the number of women who had come to prison as a ‘place of safety’, either on remand or recall to custody. Many of these women should not have been in prison and were only there because there was insufficient provision in the community. **Bronzefield**

Respect

More needed to provide decency

It was disappointing that support for women to maintain relationships with their children and families had been slow to recover after the pandemic. However,

Foston Hall had made progress in response to our previous concerns, and the mother and baby units at Bronzefield, Eastwood Park and New Hall supported women and their children very well.

[The mother and baby unit]... was spacious and clean and had good facilities, including a stimulating nursery and outside play area. Women who lived in the unit received excellent multi-agency assistance and told us they felt well supported. **New Hall**

Health services were generally good, although delivery was sometimes hindered by staff shortages. Too many mentally unwell women continued to be sent to prison due to the lack of mental health treatment in the community and many, including at Bronzefield and Eastwood Park, waited too long to transfer to hospital.

Bronzefield provided good support for women with mental health needs on and following their release, with emotional and practical assistance on the day of their release and up to three months afterwards.

The concerns raised by the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman on the deaths of two babies in prisons, including one at Bronzefield, had been carefully considered and responded to.

Leaders had shown a genuine commitment to addressing Prisons and Probation Ombudsman health recommendations related to the death of a baby born at the prison – they had developed a mental health perinatal team and enhanced working links with maternity services in the community. **Bronzefield**

Work to promote fair treatment for different groups of women prisoners had stalled or declined at the three sites we inspected. Leaders too often relied on a narrow dataset and consulted prisoners too infrequently to have a real understanding of the needs of those with protected characteristics.

Cells were mostly well equipped, but some shared by two women were cramped. Prison food was often unpopular and, disappointingly, there were limited or no opportunities for women to prepare or cook their own food at any of the three prisons. Women frequently told us that the range of items they were able to buy was too limited and did not meet their needs. In our survey, 52% said the shop/canteen sold the things they needed.

Purposeful activity

Too little time out of cell and not enough to do

Time out of cell was too limited at all three inspection sites. For example, at New Hall, 31% of prisoners were locked up during the working day compared with only 3% at our previous inspection in 2019. The limited

daily regime at each site was further curtailed by the shortage of officers to unlock them on time or at all. In our survey, 66% of women said they were unlocked for less than two hours on Saturdays and Sundays, compared with 36% on a typical weekday.

Gym provision and access were reasonably good at each prison, and in our survey, 51% of women said they could access the gym or sports at least twice a week, compared with 34% of men. In Bronzefield and Eastwood Park, women had sufficient access to well-stocked libraries, but at New Hall the service had not yet recovered sufficiently from the pandemic restrictions.

Ofsted judged the quality of education, skills and work to be good at Bronzefield but inadequate at the other two prisons. Bronzefield had sufficient activity places for the population and short waiting lists; most women benefited from a challenging curriculum and there were high levels of achievement. In contrast, the curriculum at Eastwood Park was not broad enough, with too few opportunities and few coherent pathways for women to progress, leaving them feeling frustrated. At New Hall, despite sufficient activity spaces, there was a narrow curriculum and no needs analysis to underpin provision.

Data... showed that a very high proportion of women had English and mathematics needs identified at below level 1, but the curriculum did not reflect this, and waiting lists for these subjects were long. **New Hall**

Preparation for release

Variable support for life on the outside

Far too many women were released without a sustainable place to live. The support for remand prisoners varied, and in some prisons they were excluded from services that were available to sentenced prisoners, such as housing assessments or debt advice.

Work to reduce reoffending was properly focused and the quality of offender management was reasonably good at all three prisons. Importantly, the impact of trauma and abuse was increasingly taken into account with good support offered at each prison.

Leaders had prioritised offender management and resettlement services, which had both improved since the last inspection. Staffing in the offender management unit (OMU) was better and, following national changes in 2021, there had been considerable investment in resettlement support.

Eastwood Park

It was of concern that some public protection arrangements were weak at all three sites.

Interventions or programmes designed to address offending behaviour were limited. Personality disorder services for those with highly complex needs were good, but consistent delivery was sometimes hampered by staff shortages.

Support for women in the run-up to and on the day of their release varied considerably, but positive initiatives included a discharge board at Eastwood Park, a ‘through-the-gate’ worker at Bronzefield and a ‘departure lounge’ at New Hall.

Women received very good support on the morning of their release from reception staff and a through-the-gate worker with a team of community volunteers. They met the women in reception and accompanied them from the gate to the railway station, helping with small practical needs along the way. **Bronzefield**

Release on temporary licence (ROTL) had been slow to regain momentum, but for the very few women who had benefited there were tangible outcomes, including securing employment on release. In Eastwood Park, opportunities for higher risk women to undertake their first ROTL event had been limited due to the lack of officers to escort them on their visit.

Five

Children in custody



This section draws on findings from full inspections at three young offender institutions (YOIs) holding children aged 15 to 18 and five independent reviews of progress (IRPs), and an inspection of one secure training centre holding children aged 12 to 18. All the findings from inspections in this section are based on the fourth edition of **Expectations: Criteria for assessing the treatment of children and conditions in prisons**, published in November 2018, or **Joint inspection framework: secure training centres**, published in February 2014, revised March 2019.

- The impact of the pandemic continued to be felt both positively and negatively. The population of children (under 18s only) in young offender institutions, secure training centres and secure children's homes remained at historic lows with an average of 438 children in custody throughout the year, which had the effect of improving staff to child ratios at all sites. However, with the exception of Parc, time out of cell and access to education required considerable improvement.
- Outcomes for children in custody varied dramatically between establishments. The key challenge for leaders was to unpick the increased conflict created by splitting children into small groups throughout the pandemic – too often this was managed by keeping children apart from each other, preventing access to education and other activity for many children. By contrast, at

Parc good relationships between staff and children provided a strong foundation for effective behaviour management, which enabled leaders to deliver much more time out of cell and access to education than at the other sites.

- We carried out IRPs in YOIs holding children for the first time in 2022–23.

Young offender institutions

Table 9: Children’s outcomes in YOIs inspected in 2022–23

	Safety	Respect	Purposeful activity	Rehabilitation and release planning
Feltham (A)	Reasonably good	Reasonably good	Not sufficiently good	Reasonably good
Parc	Good	Good	Good	Good
Werrington	Poor	Reasonably good	Poor	Reasonably good

Outcome of previous recommendations

In the YOIs reported on in 2022–23:

- 67% of our previous main/key concern recommendations in the area of safety had been achieved and 33% had not been achieved
- 50% of our previous main/key concern recommendations in the area of care had been achieved and 50% had not been achieved
- 60% of our previous main/key concern recommendations in the area of purposeful activity had been achieved and 40% had not been achieved
- 57% of our previous main/key concern recommendations in the area of resettlement had been achieved and 43% had not been achieved.

Safety

Behaviour managed at the expense of free movement

Challenging violence and managing behaviour

Effective behaviour management is impossible without meaningful relationships between staff and the children in their care. Staff at two establishments – Parc and Feltham – challenged low-level poor behaviour and explained to children what they had done wrong, helping to reinforce boundaries and promote positive behaviour. Feltham, additionally, used an immediate

reward scheme effectively, and there had been a reduction in violence and a lower use of adjudications. No children in our survey at Parc told us they felt unsafe at the time of the inspection. In contrast, at Werrington and Cookham Wood behaviour management schemes were not understood or monitored effectively, incentives to encourage positive behaviour were too limited, and violence remained far too high.

At all sites, children were separated into groups and, although their size varied at each prison, children were unable to mix freely due to concerns over tensions and rivalries between them. There was a need to address this conflict at all sites to improve children's access to education and other opportunities, but it was particularly acute at Werrington.

Staff had identified 263 keep-aparts (where there was a risk of violence if children mixed) among a population of 66 children... Staff spent most of their time managing this which affected every aspect of life for the children. **Werrington**

Some improvements in use of force and separation

We saw reduced levels of force in establishments that had better behaviour management processes. All sites had reasonable governance arrangements to make sure that the force used was proportionate and necessary, and took corrective action where needed. Pain-inducing techniques during restraint had been used inappropriately at Feltham but leaders had taken appropriate steps to address our concerns.

The use of de-escalation was improving; both Werrington and Feltham had seen a marked reduction in the number of children placed back in their cells, face down under restraint. In Feltham this had reduced by 88% since our last inspection.

There were some improved arrangements for the governance of separation in Feltham, Wetherby and Cookham Wood, but despite these, separated children at most sites did not have a regime that was equitable to their peers. Although Werrington did not have a formal separation unit, the time that children had been separated was longer than at most other YOIs; leaders had no reintegration plans for separated children and no formal oversight of separation in the six months before our inspection. The planning for reintegration of separated children at Parc and Feltham was more robust and began early in a child's separation, which improved their outcomes.

Mixed support to prevent suicide and self-harm

Care for children at Parc with a history of self-harming was good and focused appropriately on providing activity and support from both staff and families. At Feltham and Werrington, self-harm had reduced. However, at Werrington children did not feel supported by the case management process and the quality of documents required improvement.

Child protection referrals were well managed and made appropriately at Parc, but at Werrington we found examples of incidents that met the safeguarding reporting criteria that were not referred to the local authority. We followed up two recommendations about safeguarding in our IRPs at Feltham and Wetherby; in both cases, we found insufficient progress.

At the previous inspection we found that ambulances were not always called when a medical emergency code was used... Since this time leaders had briefed control room staff to make sure ambulances were called when an emergency code was used... There were some examples of good practice, but during our visit, we observed an emergency code being called, which did not result in a request for [an] ambulance being made. **Feltham**

Care

Varied conditions for everyday life

Children feel a lack of care

The quality of relationships varied across children's prisons, but overall too few children felt cared for by staff. At Werrington, just 33% of children in our survey said they felt cared for, and we found that interaction with staff was transactional. At Feltham, relationships had improved and it was positive that leaders had committed to weekly custody support plan meetings with children. Across all sites, leaders needed to make sure that staff consistently challenged low-level poor behaviour and encouraged children to engage with education and other activities.

Daily life not child-friendly

Accommodation at many YOIs was not designed for children; in particular, the very large living units at Werrington and Wetherby were institutional and did not support effective relationships or behaviour management. The lack of private rooms at Cookham Wood and Feltham also hindered children's access to interventions and activities. Cleanliness had improved across most sites; most notably at Parc, communal areas had been kept clean, equipment was in good condition and well maintained, and staff encouraged and helped children to keep their cells clean.

Most children continued to eat all their meals alone in their cells. The exception was Parc where children enjoyed eating their meals together, and staff sat or ate with them at mealtimes. Feltham had also started doing this on a rota, although most meals continued to be eaten in cell.

The introduction of laptops for every child was a very good initiative. YOIs had moved towards an electronic system for children to make applications for day-to-day services, and the laptops were set up to provide helpful information, make applications or raise complaints, and enable children to check their prison shop spending themselves without relying on staff to do it.

Lack of focus on equality and diversity

Focus on equality and diversity had lapsed during the pandemic and there was limited evidence of recovery in this area. In our survey, children with disabilities responded more negatively than those without disabilities about their perceptions of safety. It was concerning that most sites did not investigate or take action to address disparities for different groups of children. The exception was Feltham.

Leaders and managers had developed a tool that enabled the collection of data specific to Feltham A. Individual managers could now identify if minority groups suffered any unequal treatment in their areas of responsibility. Equality and diversity outcomes were now discussed in strategic meetings across the establishment and areas of concern were escalated to a diversity and inclusion monthly meeting (DIMM) for investigation. **Feltham IRP**

Some progress on health services

Health providers delivered a generally good service for children. However, at Parc, access to an appropriate range of mental health treatments to make sure that children could start addressing some of their emotional and psychological trauma remained elusive, even though we had raised this as a key concern in 2019.

Werrington had progressed with quality improvements, with health staff reviewing CCTV coverage of a group assault to identify undisclosed injuries and the notable development of closer working arrangements with families.

Practice Plus Group worked with the YOI family engagement officer to acquire health-related information from parents and carers to inform the health care of their children. Families were able to talk to nurses and be reassured that their children would be looked after. Other age-appropriate initiatives by the family engagement officer to keep families involved with their child included a virtual discussion forum, regular newsletters, and additional contact during times of important family events. **Werrington**

Purposeful activity

Too much time spent locked up

After five IRPs during the year, we found that reasonable progress had been made against only one of five recommendations about the time children spent out of their cells. No YOI met our expectation that children should be unlocked for 10 hours a day. Parc came the closest with between eight and 11 hours on weekdays. Regimes were more limited at the other four YOIs, offering up to 6.5 hours unlocked on weekdays at Feltham, six hours at Cookham Wood and Wetherby, and 5.5 hours at Werrington. Weekends were worse at all five sites with an average of between three and six hours out of cell on Saturdays and Sundays.

However, delivery of these regimes was inconsistent and some children experienced very little time out of cell. Staff difficulties at all sites, except Parc, resulted in regime curtailments that restricted children's time unlocked. This often affected the evening and weekend activities that supported relationship-building with staff and peers, and children's well-being. Conflicts between children could further limit time out of cell.

Activity out of cells was affected by conflicts between children who could not all be unlocked at the same time. Progress had been made to reduce the number of conflicts, but the regime was still compromised for most children. **Werrington IRP**

Most children had regular access to physical education and time in the fresh air, but opportunities to visit on-site libraries were not as good.

Parc had maintained the very effective education it had provided during the pandemic and was assessed by Estyn as delivering excellent outcomes for children. In contrast, Ofsted assessed outcomes at Feltham as requiring improvement and at Werrington as inadequate. Children at Werrington could only attend a maximum of 15 hours of education weekly and this was further reduced by late arrival at lessons. At our IRPs to the four YOIs in England, Ofsted assessed at least reasonable progress in the majority of areas identified as requiring improvement, which was hopeful.

Resettlement

More needed to prepare for release

There was variable support for children to have contact with their family and friends. They appreciated the in-cell phones and issue of secure laptops at most YOIs, but use of secure video calls was patchy, with disappointingly low take-up at Cookham Wood. Improvements such as weekend visits (Wetherby and Keppel unit) and family days (Cookham Wood and Feltham) had helped encourage visits, but at Cookham Wood, only 19% of children in our survey who got visits said that they received them at least weekly.

Children continued to have regular sentence and remand plan review meetings, with attempts to express their targets in age-appropriate ways at Werrington and Feltham. Despite this, too many children still did not know that they had a plan with targets to work towards, and the disconnect that we described last year between sentence planning and day-to-day care of children remained.

An increase in the number of children with, or facing, long or indeterminate sentences was noted at most sites and was leading to some new initiatives. These included a pilot buddying scheme at Werrington and briefing workshops at Feltham to explain court proceedings to children facing trial for the most serious offences.

There had been some improvement in the provision of release accommodation for children, but still too few left with an education, training or work placement to go to.

Signs of improvement at Oakhill secure training centre

Outcomes for children at Oakhill had improved since Ofsted and HMI Prisons last visited, but required further improvement to be good.

Levels of violence and the use of force had reduced but remained high, and oversight had improved. Child safeguarding procedures were better and benefited from scrutiny by senior leaders, although this led to some delays. There was also improved multi-agency oversight from the police, local authority designated officers and the Youth Custody Service.

A new director had introduced more child-focused practices and procedures, and leaders were more visible and interested in children's well-being and progress. Restrictions on children mixing were being relaxed and effective conflict resolution work was reducing tensions and disputes. Support and training for frontline staff had also improved and more care was being taken in recruiting the right people.

Communal areas and kitchens were much cleaner and there were continuing planned refurbishments to provide a less institutionalised environment for children.

Children's physical and emotional health needs were met through high standards of professional care and support. Staff were also more aware of specific issues, including neurodivergent conditions such as autism spectrum disorder, which helped to inform their day-to-day engagements.

Children attended education every day and most were making good progress in their learning. They now spent 13 hours a day outside of their cells, but this reduced to 12 hours at weekends as children were locked up for an hour at lunchtimes, contrary to Ofsted standards for secure training centres.

Six

Immigration detention



We published inspection reports on three immigration removal centres (Brook House, near Gatwick Airport, Colnbrook, near Heathrow Airport and Derwentside, County Durham), as well as three short-term holding facilities used to hold migrants who arrived on the south coast (Manston, Western Jet Foil and Lydd Airport) and an overseas removal flight to Zimbabwe. We also conducted a thematic review on the experiences of immigration detainees held in prisons. All our findings are based on the fourth edition of our **Expectations: Criteria for assessing the conditions for and treatment of immigration detainees**, published in January 2018.

- Immigration removal centres (IRCs) were generally safe and stable, but many detainees were still held for long periods without any prospect of removal, including some considered vulnerable under Home Office policy. Derwentside IRC, opened in November 2021 to hold women, provided generally good treatment, but had some concerning initial problems, including a lack of activities and poor oversight of the use of force.
- The new short-term holding facilities (STHFs) opened to hold migrants arriving on the south coast were an improvement on those inspected previously. However, they were not equipped to accommodate large numbers for long periods. Our inspection of Manston and the associated facilities in July 2022 identified many flaws which we said would have negative results

if allowed to continue. Subsequent reporting by other bodies, and a visit from our Chief Inspector, indicated that some poor outcomes did ensue and we made a full re-inspection of these STHFs in February 2023 (to be published in the 2023–24 reporting year).

- The escort flight to Zimbabwe was generally well managed, but many detainees were poorly informed and did not understand what was happening to them.

Continuing changes in immigration detention

The immigration detention estate continued to change this year, with recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic and the high number of people arriving in the UK by small boats. Following the removal of COVID-19 restrictions, the number of people held in most IRCs increased. At the same time, record numbers of people arrived across the Channel on the south coast with many detained in STHFs, including children.

The number of people held in prison under immigration powers reduced slightly this year, as removal flights and transfers to IRCs resumed, but remained too high for the less suitable conditions provided by prisons.

Immigration removal centres

Long periods in custody

At all three IRCs we visited this year, some detainees were held for long periods. At Brook House, five people had been held for over six months, including one held for 16 months. In most of these cases there was little prospect of removal, owing to suspensions of international travel or necessary legal processes, and the lack of regular updates from the Home Office on case progression was a major frustration at Colnbrook and Brook House; more than half of detainees at these centres ended up being released into the community.

The person detained the longest at Brook House had been there for 16 months and we found five cases where people had been held in different places of detention for over 1,000 days. **Brook House IRC**

At Brook House, the Home Office had recognised more than a third of detainees as vulnerable under its ‘adults at risk’ policy, and three of the 25 women at Derwentside during our inspection were assessed as at the highest level of vulnerability – with ongoing detention inherently detrimental to their well-being. In all three IRCs, we found people whose detention was maintained even when health professionals considered them unfit for it.

Many women held at the establishment were highly vulnerable. Most had lived in the UK for some time and many had long and complex immigration backgrounds. They were well cared for in the centre, but in some cases it was clear that the experience of detention had adversely affected their health and well-being. **Derwentside IRC**

Fortunately, self-harm across the detention estate remained rare and generally low level, but the quality of assessment, care in detention and teamwork (ACDT) case management documentation was variable, and we found some serious weaknesses in this at each centre inspected.

In all three IRCs, detainees continued to be held in detention because of a lack of suitable accommodation in the community. At Brook House and Derwentside, this included highly vulnerable detainees who had been granted bail in principle and were awaiting suitable accommodation. At both centres, we found detainees who had been waiting for suitable accommodation for five months, which was far too long.

Some good care, but weaknesses that need correcting

The level of violence across the IRC estate remained low, and any incidents were usually minor. At Colnbrook and Brook House, the oversight of the use of force by centre staff was generally good, but at Derwentside we found some concerning problems: while force was rare, footage of incidents from body-worn cameras was not always available, record-keeping was poor, and governance processes sometimes failed to identify inappropriate and potentially injurious conduct when force was applied.

At both Brook House and Colnbrook, conditions remained prison-like and detainees were locked in their rooms overnight. Communal areas were generally clean and tidy, although it was difficult to control the temperature of residential units. At Derwentside, the living conditions were good and women were not locked in their rooms.

Relationships between staff and detainees at all centres were generally positive, and in our detainee surveys most respondents said that staff treated them respectfully, ranging from 84% at Brook House to 100% at Derwentside. In Brook House and Colnbrook, many staff reported low morale and a lack of support from leaders. In all centres, professional interpreters were not used enough when detainees could not communicate in English – including at key points such as during reception interviews and case reviews of those identified as at risk of self-harm.

Screening and vaccination for communicable diseases were well embedded in all three centres, and in our detainee survey, the majority were satisfied with the general health provision. At Derwentside, which had good health care staffing, women had prompt access to health services and we identified several areas of notable practice for women-centred care. However, staffing pressures had affected delivery of mental health care at both Brook House and Colnbrook, where vacancies of around 70% were compounded by the lack of psychological interventions.

No psychologist had been available since August 2021 for those requiring trauma-informed psychological interventions. **Colnbrook IRC**

The lack of detainee access to mental health services, and the detrimental effects of continuing detention on some, were concerns at all sites.

Detention in prison – disadvantages for detainees

Our review of the experience of immigration detainees held in prisons, published in October 2022, found that they were markedly disadvantaged compared with those held in IRCs, with many in custody for long periods with little or no progress in their cases being made by the Home Office. Detainees struggled to access legal advice: very few had been told that they were entitled to half an hour of free advice, and many prison and Home Office staff who we spoke to were not themselves aware of this entitlement. Perhaps most worryingly, vulnerable detainees, including victims of torture, were not routinely identified, nor their release considered in the same way as in IRCs.

Chief Inspector Charlie Taylor commented: ‘Some of these people are extremely vulnerable. If these vulnerabilities are not monitored and addressed effectively, there is an increased risk that they will come to harm while in custody and that the integrity of the decision-making in their immigration cases will be undermined’.

Short-term holding facilities

Manston – some improvements, but serious flaws emerged

We inspected short-term holding facilities at Western Jet Foil, Lydd Airport and Manston in July 2022.

These sites are used to process migrants who arrive on the south coast by small boat. At the time of our first inspection, Western Jet Foil and Manston had been operational for less than a year, and we found considerable improvements to their infrastructure and processes compared with previous sites. Nevertheless, we noted several concerns about Manston and Western Jet Foil, especially that many exhausted detainees were held in non-residential accommodation for over 24 hours. While detainees arriving at Western Jet Foil were screened by health professionals for urgent care needs and symptoms of communicable diseases, their initial and ongoing assessment there and at Manston often took place in communal spaces without the use of interpreters; this compromised the identification of health needs and treatment requirements. There was also poor recording of information, including on the use of force and vulnerability.

Following our first inspection, there were reports of significant problems at Manston, including high numbers of detainees held there for long periods and outbreaks of infectious diseases. We returned to conduct a second inspection in February 2023, with the report published in our 2023–24 reporting year.

Removals to Rwanda

At the time of our inspection of Brook House, 68 detainees held there had been told that the Home Office was considering their removal to Rwanda, of whom 19 had been served with removal directions for a flight scheduled during the inspection. In the end, the flight did not depart.

We found several concerns in the planned removal process. Asylum screening interviews had been brief, and several detainees were classed as adults at risk or were on open ACDT documents due to concerns about self-harm. In some cases, detainees had young children and we saw no evidence that the Home Office had assessed the possibility of family reunification in Rwanda. Detainees had been given little relevant information about Rwanda or the removal process, and in many cases were reliant on welfare staff in the centre to assist them in finding suitable legal representation. Immigration documents were given to detainees in English only, and some had been unable to find solicitors to help them respond to legal documents within the deadlines set by the Home Office.

Overseas escorts

Removal charter flights had resumed in 2021 after an interval of some years, and we inspected one such flight to Zimbabwe. Nine detainees were removed: three women and six men. Several removal directions – formal notices served on a detainee that they are to be removed to another country – had been cancelled at short notice.

Some detainees knew nothing of the practical details of their removal to Zimbabwe, causing many anxieties. Transfers from the IRCs were carried out calmly, but sometimes in cramped conditions. Detainees spent long periods on the coach before boarding the flight, with the longest transfer being five hours and 45 minutes. All detainees had free access to telephones to speak to families, friends and legal advisors.

Force was used twice during the operation, but staff did not routinely take hold of compliant detainees, which was an improvement from previous flights inspected. Recording of the use of force was insufficiently detailed and there were discrepancies between records; we had seen better documentation on previous flights. Even when relevant risks had been highlighted, separation between men and women was not prioritised.

Extra support was given to one woman who was at risk of self-harm and this was generally well managed by staff, but there was no evidence that a care plan was followed for a man identified as vulnerable after leaving the centre. We observed staff treating detainees with respect and saw some good interactions, but there were some insensitive behaviours by escorting officers, including inappropriate cheering when the plane landed in Zimbabwe. Disembarkation was managed effectively.

Seven

Court custody



This section draws on inspections of custody facilities in three court clusters: Kent; Lancashire and Cumbria; and Cheshire and Merseyside. All the findings from inspections in this section are based on the second version of **Expectations for court custody: Criteria for assessing the treatment of and conditions for detainees in court custody**, published in March 2020.

- The leadership of court custody was properly focused on decency and respect for detainees, but shortages of staff caused delays and limited provision for children.
- There were still few facilities for detainees with disabilities and those who spoke little or no English, and some detainees were not monitored when they should have been.
- Some detainees continued to be held in the courts for longer than necessary, and some physical conditions were still inadequate.
- Health provision had improved, but there was variation in provision for those with mental health needs, and inadequacies in emergency training and equipment.
- People attending court from prison and subsequently freed continued to be held in custody for too long before they were released.

Leadership was focused and multi-agency relationships were improving

Leaders in the three main agencies responsible for court custody, HM Courts & Tribunals Service (HMCTS), Prisoner Escort and Custody Services (PECS) and the escort and custody contracted providers, GEOAmev and Serco, were properly focused on holding detainees in decent conditions and treating them respectfully. The use of performance indicators, contract management arrangements and data to identify and address areas where outcomes for detainees could be better was developing.

Engagement between the three main agencies was improving and they were working towards a better understanding of how to balance delivering the distinct needs of court business and custody provision.

A good culture prevailed among staff but provision was frequently stymied by a shortage of escort and custody officers. This was especially noticeable in the delays in transporting detainees to and from custody, and when there were insufficient specially trained staff to look after children.

Mixed experience on transfer to court

Detainees were generally transported to court in clean and well-maintained vehicles. Women and children still routinely shared transport with men when collected from police stations, but this was less prevalent for journeys to and from prisons. Detainees mostly alighted in secure areas, but where this was not possible, not enough was always done to maintain their dignity and privacy.

Variations in individual needs and rights

There had been good attention to improving provision and awareness of equality and diversity in Kent, but there remained gaps in the other regions inspected. Facilities for people with disabilities were limited. While some staff had now grasped the importance of using professional telephone interpreting to communicate with foreign national detainees in a language they understood, the majority still ‘got by’ or used ‘sign language’, which was not good enough to assess risk and well-being.

However, more broadly, custody staff were alert to the risks posed by and to detainees. It was therefore disappointing that they were rarely briefed fully and, consequently, some detainees were not monitored at the required frequency, which was a risk.

Most detainees experienced court custody for only minimal periods, but a range of complex issues led to some staying longer than necessary. However, as previously reported, not enough was yet being done to understand or address the problem consistently.

Some improvement in conditions and care

Although there was a commitment to maintaining and improving custody facilities, investment was not yet sufficient to have addressed some inadequate conditions. It was, however, positive that we found fewer dirty cells, graffiti and serious potential ligature points than in previous inspections.

The handcuffing and searching of detainees continued to be proportionate. Force was used against detainees relatively infrequently and only as a last resort, and most incidents were low level and quickly de-escalated. Documentation to justify the need for force was mostly well completed and quality assurance measures were developing.

Detainees were generally treated respectfully and met with kindness and compassion; they were overwhelmingly positive about how custody staff had treated them. Drinks, snacks and meals were provided regularly, although the selection in Kent was poor. While most detainees remained in custody for relatively short periods, few had little or anything to keep them occupied or distract them, which was difficult for those who were anxious or neurodivergent.

The provision of activities to keep detainees occupied was poor. Staff did not recognise how helpful distraction activities could be in improving detainees' well-being and did not offer them to detainees consistently. **Cheshire and Merseyside**

Most custody staff understood their responsibility concerning the safeguarding of detainees in their care, although we were less assured in Cheshire and Merseyside. We were generally confident that some action would be taken if issues were identified.

Custody staff in Kent had a better understanding of safeguarding than we have found at recent inspections... Many staff could now explain the level of concerns which should trigger the safeguarding process. **Kent**

The provision of health services continued to improve. Each region had a contract with health care professionals who provided advice over the telephone or dispatched someone to attend in person if needed. These arrangements were now well embedded and used appropriately. However, we were concerned that custody staff were still not refreshed frequently enough in life-saving resuscitation techniques, and automated external defibrillators were not always readily accessible, which could lead to delays in potentially life-saving treatment.

The provision of liaison and diversion services, separately commissioned by NHS England, was the responsibility of local health trusts and was more variable. These services were not always well embedded and many custody staff did not even have a number to call if they were concerned about

a detainee's mental health or well-being. We saw some detainees who would have benefited from some intervention but whose needs went unmet.

Little support on release from court custody

Detainees released by the court had little assistance with release planning, beyond a ticket or fare to their onward destination. There was very little local information concerning agencies or charities that could offer support if needed.


We continued to be concerned about the delays experienced by detainees who arrived from prison and were subsequently released by the court. It was unacceptable that people who were essentially free could wait hours locked in a cell before someone at their originating prison authorised their release. While senior managers in PECS had highlighted the need for prisons to deal with such cases speedily, we found little evidence of improvement, and people continued to be denied their freedom for too long.

... 85 of the 102 detainees released from prison during the previous four months had waited more than an hour, with the longest wait being five hours and 59 minutes... Such delays were a concern in our last inspection and still unnecessarily denied people their liberty for too long and were unacceptable.

Lancashire and Cumbria

Eight

The Inspectorate



Our inspections

Most of our inspections benefit from the assistance of other inspectorates, and inspections of secure training centres are undertaken jointly with Ofsted, or Estyn in Wales, and the Care Quality Commission.

Our inspections are carried out against published inspection criteria known as **Expectations**, which consider outcomes for detainees. Expectations are based on and referenced against international and regional human rights standards, with the aim of promoting treatment and conditions in detention which at least meet recognised human rights standards.

Expectations for inspections of adult men's and women's prisons and YOIs are based on our four tests of a healthy establishment. For men's prisons, the four tests are: safety, respect, purposeful activity, and rehabilitation and release planning. The tests for women's prisons and YOIs vary slightly. The tests for immigration detention facilities are similar but consider the specific circumstances applying to detainees, that they are not being held for committing a criminal offence and their detention may not have been as a result of a judicial process. In other inspection sectors, the principles underpinning the healthy establishment concept are applied but the specific focus varies, depending on the sector.

Each expectation describes the standard of treatment and conditions an establishment is expected to achieve.

These are underpinned by a series of ‘indicators’, which describe evidence that may show the expectation being met. The list of indicators is not exhaustive and does not exclude other ways of achieving the expectation.

The inspection team assesses the establishment’s performance against the healthy establishment tests using the following judgements:

Definition

Outcomes for prisoners/detainees are good

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

Outcomes for prisoners/detainees are reasonably good

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

Outcomes for prisoners/detainees are not sufficiently good

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

Outcomes for prisoners/detainees are poor

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

Inspectors use five key sources of evidence in making their assessments:

- observation
- prisoner/detainee surveys
- discussions with prisoners/detainees
- discussions with staff and relevant third parties
- documentation.

HMI Prisons usually operates an almost entirely unannounced inspection programme (other than in exceptional circumstances), with all inspections following up recommendations/concerns from the previous inspection. There is a minimum frequency for inspection of all types of establishments, with the timing of inspections deliberately unpredictable. Such an approach is based on, and responsive to, considered information and proactive risk assessment.

We inspect prisons at least once every five years, although high-risk establishments are inspected more frequently. We also conduct independent reviews of progress (IRPs), short follow-up visits to about 20 prisons a year. They aim to provide independent evidence about how much progress has been made in improving the treatment and conditions for prisoners following our recommendations/concerns from previous inspections.

We visit children's establishments every year for either an inspection or an IRP.

Every immigration removal centre (IRC) also usually receives a full unannounced inspection at least once every four years, or every two years if it holds children. Non-residential short-term holding facilities (STHFs) are inspected at least once every six years. Residential STHFs are inspected at least once every four years. Within this framework, all immigration inspections are scheduled on a risk-assessed basis.

We inspect court custody facilities at least once every six years.

In addition to inspections of individual establishments, we produce thematic reports on cross-cutting issues, singly or with other inspectorates, including as part of the Criminal Justice Joint Inspection process. We also use our inspection findings to make observations and recommendations relating to proposed legislative and policy changes.

OPCAT and the National Preventive Mechanism

All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees.


Income and expenditure – 1 April 2022 to 31 March 2023

Income	£
Ministry of Justice (prisons and court cells)	4,757,000
Home Office (immigration detention)	352,220
Home Office (HMICFRS/police custody)	85,260
Youth Justice Board/Youth Justice Commissioning Team (YJCT) (children's custody)	126,498
Other income (HMI Probation, Prisons and Probation Ombudsman, secure training centre, Ministry of Defence, Border Force)	38,816
Total	5,359,794

Expenditure	Total (£)	%
Staff costs (includes staff, fee-paid inspectors, secondees and joint inspection/partner organisation costs, e.g. General Pharmaceutical Council and contribution to secretariat support of the Joint Criminal Justice Inspection Chief Inspectors Group)	4,537,921	86%
Travel and subsistence	607,965	12%
Printing and stationery	5,222	0.10%
Information technology and telecommunications (includes the cost of discovery work on a replacement IT solution for current Evidence Gathering Template)	61,858	1.17%
Translators	7,000	0.13%
Training and development	29,694	0.56%
Other costs (including recruitment costs, conferences and professional memberships)	29,079	0.55%
Total	5,278,739	100%

Note: Percentages do not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Expenditure 1 April 2022 to 31 March 2023



- Staff costs: 86%
- Travel and subsistence: 12%
- Other: 2%

Staff and associates

Our staff and fee-paid associates come from a range of professional backgrounds. While many have experience of working in prisons, others have expertise in social work, probation, law, youth justice, health care and drug treatment, social research and policy. Most staff are permanent, but we also take inspectors on loan from HMPPS and other organisations. We engage associates based on their expertise in areas we inspect to enhance our employed staff. Currently, six staff are loaned from HMPPS, and their experience and familiarity with current practice are invaluable to our work.

	Charlie Taylor	Chief Inspector
	Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief Inspector
	Amarpreet Kaur	Executive Assistant to Charlie Taylor and Martin Lomas
	Georgia Stack	Inspection Support Officer

A Team (adult male prisons)	Sara Pennington	A Team Leader
	Natalie Heeks	Inspector
	Martin Kettle	Inspector
	Jade Richards	Inspector
O Team (prisons holding women)	Sandra Fieldhouse	O Team Leader
	Sumayyah Hassam	Inspector
	Kellie Reeve	Inspector
	Rebecca Stanbury	Inspector
	Jonathan Tickner	Inspector
N Team (adult male and young adult prisons)	Deborah Butler	N Team Leader
	Ian Dickens	Inspector
	Lindsay Jones	Inspector
	Alice Oddy	Inspector
	David Owens	Inspector
	Nadia Syed	Inspector

Y Team (establishments holding children)	Angus Jones	Y Team Leader
	David Foot	Inspector
	Angela Johnson	Inspector
	Esra Sari	Inspector
	Donna Ward	Inspector
I Team (immigration detention)	Hindpal Singh Bhui	I Team Leader
	Rebecca Mavin	Inspector
	Chelsey Pattison	Inspector
	Fiona Shearlaw	Inspector
Health Services Team	Tania Osborne	Head of Health and Social Care Inspection
	Steve Eley	Health and Social Care Inspector
	Shaun Thomson	Health and Social Care Inspector

Research, Data and Thematics Team	Sophie Riley	Head of Research, Data and Thematics
	Helen Ranns	Senior Research Officer
	Joe Simmonds	Senior Research Officer
	Charlotte Betts	Research Officer
	Helen Downham	Research Officer
	Samantha Rasor	Research Officer
	Alexander Scragg	Research Officer
	Emma King	Research Assistant
	Grace Edwards	Research Trainee
	Reanna Walton	Research Trainee

Secretariat	Jane Boys	Head of Secretariat
	Lesley Young	Head of Finance, HR and Inspection Support
	Sharon Curtis	Finance and Inspection Support Manager
	Umar Farooq	HR and Inspection Support Manager
	Caroline Fitzgerald	Inspection Support Officer
	Silvia Janus	Inspection Support Officer
	Serife Suleyman	Inspection Support Officer
	Elizabeth Barker	Head of Communications and Publications
	Tamsin Williamson	Publications Manager
	Sam Gluckstein	Head of NPM Secretariat
	Jane Kilpatrick	NPM Assistant Coordinator
	Elizabeth Renard	Head of Policy
	Emily Cretch	Policy Officer

Fee-paid associates

Dee Angwin	Inspector
Liz Calderbank	Inspector
Anne Clifford	Editor
Lynn Glassup	Inspector
Sarah Goodwin	Health Inspector
Martyn Griffiths	Inspector
Jeanette Hall	Inspector
Deri Hughes-Roberts	Inspector
Maureen Jamieson	Health Inspector
Louise Johns-Shepherd	Inspector
Brenda Kirsch	Editor
Sally Lester	Inspector
Stephen Oliver-Watts	Inspector
Adrienne Penfield	Editor
Yasmin Prabhudas	Editor
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Christopher Rush	Inspector
Paul Tarbuck	Inspector
Dionne Walker	Inspector

Staff and associates who left this reporting year

Heather Acornley	Research Associate
Hannah Baker	Publications and Digital Communications Officer
Elenor Ben-Ari	Research Trainee
Barbara Buchanan	Senior Personal Secretary to the Chief Inspector
Rachel Duncan	Research Assistant
Charleen Fenteng	Admin Support Officer to the Deputy Chief Inspector
Jade Glenister	Head of Policy
Lucy Gregg	Head of NPM Secretariat
Amelia Horn	Publications Assistant
Keith Humphreys	Inspector
Rahul Jalil	Senior Research Officer
Reeta Jobanputra	Communications Officer
Amilcar Johnson	Research Officer

Staff and associates who left this reporting year

Sneha Khimani	Inspection Support Officer
Alec Martin	Research Officer
Ed Owen	Communications Consultant
Tamara Pattinson	Inspector
Billie Powell	Policy Officer
Isabella Raucci	Research Trainee
Shannon Sahni	Research Associate
Stephen Seago	Finance and Inspection Support Manager
John Steele	Chief Communications Officer
Jed Waghorn	Research Associate
Nisha Waller	Research Associate
Karen Wilson	Health Inspector

Staff engagement

Every year we gather feedback from our staff. In 2022, we once again participated in the Civil Service People Survey, commissioned by the Cabinet Office. The survey was completed by 85% of HM Inspectorate of Prisons staff and the results indicated a score of 76% on the overall staff engagement index. In 2022, 87% of staff completing the ‘my work’ section of the survey said that work gave them a sense of personal accomplishment and was sufficiently challenging, and 91% of staff answering the ‘organisational objectives’ section said that they had a clear understanding of the organisation’s objectives and purpose and understood how their work contributed to them.

Stakeholder feedback

We conduct an annual online survey of stakeholders to inform our corporate planning process. A link to the questionnaire is distributed to our mailing list of contacts by email and publicised via staff and professional bulletins, a link on our website and Twitter alerts. The 2022 survey, which was conducted in November to December 2022, received 160 complete responses.

The 2022 survey was much more concise than in previous years with a focus on our communications. Responses were received from a range of stakeholders and organisations, the majority of whom were prison service staff (60%) and people

who work or volunteer for another monitoring board, ombudsman or third sector organisation (23%).

Responses about our inspection reports were very positive, with 89% agreeing the report structure is easy to follow, 88% agreeing the design makes the reports easy to read and 87% agreeing that reports are sufficiently detailed. A third of respondents (33%) said that they had looked at noticeable positive practice on our website, with 81% of those finding it useful.

Respondents reported being kept up-to-date with our work mostly via the website. Respondents who had visited the website mostly accessed it to read inspection reports. When asked how easy it was to find what they were looking for on the website, 91% said that it was very or quite easy. Of the 32% of respondents who read our tweets, 80% found them very or quite useful.

Responses to questions about our values were positive, with 84% agreeing that HMI Prisons works in the interest of prisoners/detainees and is independent of the prison service, and 73% agreeing that HMI Prisons recognises and encourages positive change and improvement.

Respondents also provided some useful ideas for new thematic areas which will be considered when developing future thematic inspection programmes.

More information on the results can be found at:

www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-hmi-prisons/stakeholder-survey

Communications

We issued 66 media releases in the year, an increase from 53 in the previous year. Our Twitter feed, which at the end of March 2022 had around 18,200 followers, grew to around 19,100 followers. Our LinkedIn account grew from around 1,200 followers to over 4,100, including many professionals in the prison sector.

Video content continued to be an effective way of engaging people with our work: our video of an ex-offender talking about how not being able to read affected his time in prison was seen more than 10,000 times. A video of Sandra Fieldhouse, team leader for women's prisons, talking about HMP/YOI Eastwood Park was viewed more than 11,000 times, and a tweet showing Chief Inspector Charlie Taylor on Sky News Breakfast talking about the same prison was seen more than 45,000 times. In November, we published a thematic review of the experiences of black adult male prisoners and black prison staff and a video of the launch event introducing the report's key findings to stakeholders was viewed nearly 1,000 times. The tweet announcing the publication of the report, meanwhile, was seen more than 28,500 times. Our inspection report on Manston short-term holding facility also gained extensive media coverage: a tweet showing Charlie Taylor speaking to Sky News was viewed more than 34,000 times. Charlie also spoke to Channel 4 News, ITV News and Channel 5 News


about conditions at Manston, stressing the importance of humane and decent conditions for all detainees.

Our blogs have also allowed us to raise awareness of key issues. The Chief Inspector's blogs on literacy have been discussed in parliament as well as by key stakeholders on LinkedIn and Twitter.

Interviews with key media outlets including the Guardian, Telegraph, Times and Spectator have also allowed us to highlight important issues, such as the lack of purposeful activity in prisons, to different audiences.

Nine

Appendices



Appendix one

Inspection reports published 1 April 2022 to 31 March 2023

Establishment	Inspection period	Date published
Swinfen Hall IRP	21–23 February 2022	1 April 2022
HM Armed Forces Service Custody Facilities	6–10 December 2021	5 April 2022
Deerbolt IRP	7–9 March 2022	12 April 2022
Coldingley	6–14 January 2022	20 April 2022
Hull IRP	14–16 March 2022	26 April 2022
Military Corrective Training Centre	17–29 January 2022	5 May 2022
Bronzefield	24 January – 4 February 2022	11 May 2022
Kent court custody	3–12 March 2022	13 May 2022
Werrington	24 January – 4 February 2022	20 May 2022

Establishment	Inspection period	Date published
Winchester	31 January – 11 February 2022	25 May 2022
Belmarsh IRP	11–13 April 2022	27 May 2022
Forest Bank	14–25 February 2022	31 May 2022
Cookham Wood IRP	25–27 April 2022	7 June 2022
Bedford	10 January – 24 February 2022	8 June 2022
Feltham A	21 February – 4 March 2022	14 June 2022
Doncaster	21 February – 4 March 2022	16 June 2022
Elmley	28 February – 11 March 2022	21 June 2022
Brixton	14–25 March 2022	30 June 2022
The Mount	14–25 March 2022	30 June 2022
Colnbrook IRC	28 February – 18 March 2022	1 July 2022

Establishment	Inspection period	Date published
Erlestoke IRP	24–26 May 2022	5 July 2022
Oakhill STC	16–20 May 2022	5 July 2022
Ranby	21 March – 8 April 2022	12 July 2022
Woodhill IRP	6–8 June 2022	14 July 2022
Parc YOI	28 March – 8 April 2022	20 July 2022
Wandsworth IRP	19–22 June 2022	29 July 2022
Separation Centres	11–22 April 2022	9 August 2022
Wayland	11–28 April 2022	12 August 2022
Spring Hill	18 April – 6 May 2022	19 August 2022
Lewes	3–13 May 2022	23 August 2022
Featherstone	9–20 May 2022	31 August 2022

Establishment	Inspection period	Date published
Berwyn	16–27 May 2022	6 September 2022
Onley	22 May – 10 June 2022	7 September 2022
Wetherby IRP	1–10 August 2022	21 September 2022
Brook House IRC	30 May – 16 June 2022	23 September 2022
Foston Hall IRP	15–17 August 2022	27 September 2022
Leeds	13–24 June 2022	29 September 2022
Nottingham	24 May – 10 June 2022	30 September 2022
Swaleside IRP	18–20 July 2022	5 October 2022
Chelmsford IRP	15–17 August 2022	7 October 2022
Parc	21 June – 8 July 2022	11 October 2022

Establishment	Inspection period	Date published
Guys Marsh	21 June – 8 July 2022	12 October 2022
Pentonville	4–14 July 2022	18 October 2022
Lancashire and Cumbria court custody	28 July – 10 August 2022	19 October 2022
Channings Wood	11–22 July 2022	21 October 2022
Western Jet Foil, Lydd Airport and Manston STHFs	25–28 July 2022	1 November 2022
Werrington IRP	12–22 September 2022	3 November 2022
Portland	25 July – 5 August 2022	4 November 2022
Rochester IRP	20–22 November 2022	8 November 2022
Liverpool	18–29 July 2022	15 November 2022

Establishment	Inspection period	Date published
Feltham A IRP	10–19 October 2022	25 November 2022
Lancaster Farms	15–26 August 2022	2 December 2022
Derwentside IRC	8–25 August 2022	6 December 2022
Isis	23 August – 16 September 2022	13 December 2022
Northumberland	22 August – 8 September 2022	14 December 2022
Zimbabwe escort and removal	7–8 September 2022	16 December 2022
Norwich	30 August – 16 September 2022	20 December 2022
Winchester IRP	14–16 November 2022	9 January 2023
Brixton IRP	21–23 November 2022	9 January 2023
Isle of Wight	20 September – 7 October 2022	17 January 2023

Establishment	Inspection period	Date published
Maidstone	3–14 October 2022	23 January 2023
Wealstun	3–14 October 2022	23 January 2023
Eastwood Park	17–28 October 2022	3 February 2023
Cheshire and Merseyside court custody	30 November – 10 December 2022	6 February 2023
Ranby IRP	3–5 January 2023	6 February 2023
Exeter	31 October – 11 November 2022	16 February 2023
Bullington	24 October – 3 November 2022	20 February 2023
Forest Bank IRP	31 October – 11 November 2022	20 February 2023
Wakefield	31 October – 11 November 2022	20 February 2023
Garth	7–18 November 2022	6 March 2023

Establishment	Inspection period	Date published
New Hall	14 November – 1 December 2022	6 March 2023
Aylesbury	22 November – 9 December 2022	14 March 2023
Hewell	22 November – 9 December 2022	20 March 2023
Parc YOI IRP	23–31 January 2023	20 March 2023
The Mount IRP	6–8 February 2023	20 March 2023

Appendix two

Healthy prison and establishment assessments 1 April 2022 to 31 March 2023

Establishment	Inspection type	Safety	Respect	Purposeful activity	Rehabilitation and release planning
---------------	-----------------	--------	---------	---------------------	-------------------------------------

Local prisons

HMP Winchester (local)	Unannounced	1	2	1	2
HMP Forest Bank	Unannounced	2	3	1	3
HMP Bedford	Unannounced	2	2	2	3
HMP & YOI Doncaster	Unannounced	3	3	2	4
HMP Elmley	Unannounced	2	2	2	2
HMP Lewes	Unannounced	2	2	1	3
HMP Leeds	Unannounced	2	3	2	3
HMP Nottingham	Unannounced	2	3	2	2
HMP Pentonville	Unannounced	2	2	1	2

Establishment	Inspection type	Safety	Respect	Purposeful activity	Rehabilitation and release planning
HMP Liverpool	Unannounced	3	4	2	3
HMP/YOI Norwich	Unannounced	2	3	1	3
HMP Exeter	Unannounced	1	2	1	3
HMP Bullingdon	Unannounced	3	3	1	2
HMP Hewell	Unannounced	2	3	1	2

Category B training prisons

HMP Garth	Unannounced	3	2	1	3
-----------	-------------	---	---	---	---

Category C training prisons

HMP Coldingley	Unannounced	3	3	2	3
HMP Winchester (West Hill)	Unannounced	3	3	1	2
HMP The Mount	Unannounced	3	2	1	2
HMP Brixton	Unannounced	2	1	1	2
HMP Ranby	Unannounced	4	3	1	1

Establishment	Inspection type	Safety	Respect	Purposeful activity	Rehabilitation and release planning
HMP Wayland	Unannounced	2	3	1	2
HMP Featherstone	Unannounced	3	2	2	2
HMP Berwyn	Unannounced	3	3	2	2
HMP Onley	Unannounced	3	3	1	2
HMP Parc	Unannounced	3	3	4	3
HMP Guys Marsh	Unannounced	2	3	2	2
HMP Channings Wood	Unannounced	3	3	2	3
HMP/YOI Portland	Unannounced	2	3	2	2
HMP Lancaster Farms	Unannounced	3	3	2	3
HMP/YOI Isis	Unannounced	2	4	1	1
HMP Northumberland	Unannounced	3	3	2	1
HMP Maidstone	Unannounced	2	3	1	2
HMP Wealstun	Unannounced	3	3	2	3

Establishment	Inspection type	Safety	Respect	Purposeful activity	Rehabilitation and release planning
HMP & YOI Aylesbury	Unannounced	2	2	1	2

Male high secure

HMP Wakefield	Unannounced	3	3	2	3
---------------	-------------	---	---	---	---

Male sex offender

HMP Isle of Wight	Unannounced	2	2	1	1
-------------------	-------------	---	---	---	---

Open prisons

HMP Spring Hill	Unannounced	4	3	2	3
-----------------	-------------	---	---	---	---

Women's prisons

HMP & YOI Bronzefield	Unannounced	3	3	3	3
HMP/YOI Eastwood Park	Unannounced	1	3	2	3
HMP/YOI New Hall	Unannounced	4	3	2	3

Establishment	Inspection type	Safety	Respect	Purposeful activity	Rehabilitation and release planning
----------------------	------------------------	---------------	----------------	----------------------------	--

Children and young people

HMYOI Werrington	Unannounced	1	3	1	3
HMYOI Feltham A	Unannounced	3	3	2	3
HMYOI Parc	Unannounced	4	4	4	4

Immigration removal centres

Colnbrook IRC	Unannounced	3	3	3	3
Brook House IRC	Unannounced	3	3	2	3
Derwentside IRC	Unannounced	2	3	3	3

Appendix three

Recommendations accepted in action plans received 1 April to 12 August 2022

Establishment	Recommendations			Accepted		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Local prisons

Forest Bank	11	6	17	10	5	15
Bedford	11	27	38	10	26	36
Winchester	12	14	26	12	13	25
Doncaster	4	8	12	3	7	10
Elmley	11	7	18	11	6	17
Total	49	62	111	46 94%	57 92%	103 93%

Note: Following 12 August 2022, action plans no longer followed up recommendations, but instead addressed concerns. HMP Wayland was the last inspection to make recommendations in this annual report year, before the transition to concerns. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Establishment	Partially accepted (includes recommendations accepted in principle / accepted subject to resources)			Rejected		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total
Local prisons						
Forest Bank	1	1	2	0	0	0
Bedford	1	1	2	0	0	0
Winchester	0	1	1	0	0	0
Doncaster	0	1	1	1	0	1
Elmley	0	1	1	0	0	0
Total	2 4%	5 8%	7 6%	1 2%	0 0%	1 1%

Establishment	Recommendations			Accepted		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Category C training prisons

Coldingley	11	11	22	9	10	19
Brixton	16	11	27	12	11	23
The Mount	11	3	14	9	3	12
Ranby	12	11	23	12	10	22
Wayland	13	13	26	13	13	26
Total	63	49	112	55 87%	47 96%	102 91%

Women's prisons

New Hall	6	10	16	4	9	13
Total	6	10	16	4 67%	9 90%	13 81%

Establishment	Partially accepted (includes recommendations accepted in principle / accepted subject to resources)			Rejected		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Category C training prisons

Coldingley	2	1	3	0	0	0
Brixton	4	0	4	0	0	0
The Mount	2	0	2	0	0	0
Ranby	0	1	1	0	0	0
Wayland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	8 13%	2 4%	10 9%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%

Women's prisons

New Hall	2	1	3	0	0	0
Total	2 33%	1 10%	3 19%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%

Establishment	Recommendations			Accepted		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Children and young people's establishments

Werrington	13	3	16	12	3	15
Feltham A	9	4	13	8	4	12
Parc	4	7	11	3	4	7
Total	4	7	11	3 75%	4 57%	7 64%

Prison total	122	128	250	108 89%	117 91%	225 90%
---------------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

Immigration removal centres

Colnbrook	6	16	22	3	13	16
Total	6	16	22	3 50%	13 81%	16 73%

Establishment	Partially accepted (includes recommendations accepted in principle / accepted subject to resources)			Rejected		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Children and young people's establishments

Werrington	1	0	1	0	0	0
Feltham A	1	0	1	0	0	0
Parc	1	3	4	0	0	0
Total	1 25%	3 43%	4 36%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%

Prison total	13 11%	11 9%	24 10%	1 1%	0 0%	1 0%
---------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

Immigration removal centres

Colnbrook	3	3	6	0	0	0
Total	3 50%	3 19%	6 27%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%

Establishment	Recommendations			Accepted		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Courts

Kent	3	17	20	3	12	15
Lancashire and Cumbria	3	12	15	3	10	13
Total	6	29	35	6 100%	22 76%	28 80%

Establishment	Partially accepted (includes recommendations accepted in principle / accepted subject to resources)			Rejected		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total
Courts						
Kent	0	4	4	0	1	1
Lancashire and Cumbria	0	1	1	0	1	1
Total	0 0%	5 17%	5 14%	0 0%	2 7%	2 6%

Appendix four

Recommendations achieved in inspection reports published 1 April 2022 to 31 March 2023

Establishment	Recommendations (excluding recommendations no longer relevant, housekeeping points and good practice)			Achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Category A prisons

Wakefield	3	48	51	0	24	24
Total	3	48	51	0 0%	24 50%	24 47%

Local prisons

Bedford	7	54	61	3	26	29
Winchester	15	14	29	2	6	8

Establishment	Partially achieved			Not achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Category A prisons

Wakefield	0	1	1	3	23	26
Total	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	3 100%	23 48%	26 51%

Local prisons

Bedford	2	12	14	2	16	18
Winchester	2	0	2	11	8	19

Establishment	Recommendations (excluding recommendations no longer relevant, housekeeping points and good practice)			Achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total
Forest Bank	8	20	28	1	7	8
Doncaster	13	19	32	7	11	18
Elmley	11	20	31	2	6	8
Lewes	5	47	52	1	19	20
Nottingham	10	19	29	4	7	11
Leeds	14	19	33	3	13	16
Pentonville	16	22	38	3	4	7
Liverpool	7	21	28	1	7	8
Norwich	15	15	30	5	11	16
Bullingdon	13	18	31	6	10	16
Exeter	5	42	47	2	11	13

Establishment	Partially achieved			Not achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total
	Forest Bank	1	0	1	6	13
Doncaster	4	3	7	2	5	7
Elmley	1	2	3	8	12	20
Lewes	1	6	7	3	22	25
Nottingham	0	1	1	6	11	17
Leeds	4	2	6	7	4	11
Pentonville	1	1	2	12	17	29
Liverpool	1	0	1	5	14	19
Norwich	3	2	5	7	2	9
Bullingdon	1	1	2	6	7	13
Exeter	0	3	3	3	28	31

Establishment	Recommendations (excluding recommendations no longer relevant, housekeeping points and good practice)			Achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total
Hewell	13	19	32	2	8	10
Total	152	349	501	42 28%	146 42%	188 38%

Category B training prisons

Garth	4	37	41	2	10	12
Total	4	37	41	2 50%	10 27%	12 29%

Category C training prisons

Coldingley	3	36	39	0	12	12
Brixton	5	29	34	0	12	12
The Mount	6	62	68	2	21	23

Establishment	Partially achieved			Not achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total
	Hewell	6	3	9	5	8
Total	27 18%	36 10%	63 13%	83 55%	167 48%	250 50%

Category B training prisons

Garth	2	4	6	0	23	23
Total	2 50%	4 11%	6 15%	0 0%	23 62%	23 56%

Category C training prisons

Coldingley	0	2	2	3	22	25
Brixton	0	1	1	5	16	21
The Mount	0	5	5	4	36	40

Establishment	Recommendations (excluding recommendations no longer relevant, housekeeping points and good practice)			Achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total
Ranby	4	34	38	2	12	14
Wayland	4	64	68	0	20	20
Featherstone	4	42	46	2	19	21
Berwyn	11	27	38	4	10	14
Onley	6	58	64	4	16	20
Guys Marsh	5	31	36	2	13	15
Channings Wood	5	55	60	2	33	35
Portland	15	15	30	9	5	14
Lancaster Farms	3	50	53	2	22	24
Isis	4	37	41	1	13	14

Establishment	Partially achieved			Not achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total
Ranby	0	2	2	2	20	22
Wayland	1	6	7	3	38	41
Featherstone	0	4	4	2	19	21
Berwyn	1	1	2	6	16	22
Onley	0	0	0	2	42	44
Guys Marsh	2	4	6	1	14	15
Channings Wood	0	2	2	3	20	23
Portland	2	0	2	4	10	14
Lancaster Farms	0	6	6	1	22	23
Isis	2	2	4	1	22	23

Establishment	Recommendations (excluding recommendations no longer relevant, housekeeping points and good practice)			Achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total
Northumberland	5	66	71	4	27	31
Wealstun	9	21	30	4	12	16
Maidstone	6	66	72	0	22	22
Aylesbury	13	12	25	2	5	7
Total	108	705	813	40 37%	274 34%	314 39%

Prisons holding sex offenders

Isle of Wight	14	20	34	5	7	12
Total	14	20	34	5 36%	7 35%	12 35%

Establishment	Partially achieved			Not achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total
	Northumberland	0	8	8	1	31
Wealstun	0	5	5	5	4	9
Maidstone	2	17	19	4	27	31
Aylesbury	1	0	1	10	7	17
Total	11 10%	65 9%	76 9%	57 53%	366 52%	423 52%
Prisons holding sex offenders						
Isle of Wight	0	4	4	9	9	18
Total	0 0%	4 20%	4 12%	9 64%	9 45%	18 53%

Establishment	Recommendations (excluding recommendations no longer relevant, housekeeping points and good practice)			Achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Multifunction

Parc	5	6	11	2	5	7
Total	5	6	11	2 40%	5 83%	7 64%

Open prisons

Spring Hill	2	26	28	1	16	17
Total	2	26	28	1 50%	16 62%	17 61%

Establishment	Partially achieved			Not achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total
Multifunction						
Parc	0	0	0	3	1	4
Total	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	3 60%	1 17%	4 36%
Open prisons						
Spring Hill	0	2	2	1	8	9
Total	0 0%	2 8%	2 7%	1 50%	8 31%	9 32%

Establishment	Recommendations (excluding recommendations no longer relevant, housekeeping points and good practice)			Achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Women's prisons

Bronzefield	1	25	26	1	10	11
Eastwood Park	10	18	28	3	6	9
New Hall	1	23	24	1	13	14
Total	12	66	78	5 42%	29 44%	34 44%

Establishment	Partially achieved			Not achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Women's prisons

Bronzefield	0	9	9	0	6	6
Eastwood Park	2	5	7	5	7	12
New Hall	0	4	4	0	6	6
Total	2 17%	18 27%	20 26%	5 42%	19 29%	24 31%

Establishment	Recommendations (excluding recommendations no longer relevant, housekeeping points and good practice)			Achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Children and young people's establishments

Werrington	9	10	19	5	2	7
Feltham A	14	13	27	10	7	17
Parc	4	12	16	1	6	7
Total	27	35	62	16 59%	15 43%	31 50%
Prison total	327	1,292	1,619	113 35%	526 41%	639 39%

Establishment	Partially achieved			Not achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Children and young people's establishments

Werrington	0	1	1	7	4	11
Feltham A	0	2	2	4	4	8
Parc	0	2	2	3	4	7
Total	0 0%	5 14%	5 8%	14 52%	12 34%	26 42%
Prison total	42 13%	135 10%	177 11%	175 54%	628 49%	803 50%

Establishment	Recommendations (excluding recommendations no longer relevant, housekeeping points and good practice)			Achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Immigration removal centres

Colnbrook	3	32	35	0	12	12
Brook House	12	22	34	1	8	9
Total	15	54	69	1 7%	20 37%	21 30%

Overseas escorts

Zimbabwe	0	6	6	0	1	1
Total	0	6	6	0 0%	1 17%	1 17%

Establishment	Partially achieved			Not achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Immigration removal centres

Colnbrook	0	6	6	3	14	17
Brook House	3	2	5	8	12	20
Total	3 20%	8 15%	11 16%	11 73%	26 48%	37 54%

Overseas escorts

Zimbabwe	0	0	0	0	5	5
Total	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	5 83%	5 83%

Establishment	Recommendations (excluding recommendations no longer relevant, housekeeping points and good practice)			Achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Courts

Kent	7	28	35	3	12	15
Lancashire and Cumbria	5	29	34	1	16	17
Merseyside and Cheshire	4	22	26	2	10	12
Total	16	79	95	6 38%	38 48%	44 46%

Military Corrective Training Centre

MCTC	1	21	22	0	11	1
Total	1	21	22	0 0%	11 52%	11 50%

Establishment	Partially achieved			Not achieved		
	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total	Main recommendations	Recommendations	Total

Courts

Kent	3	8	11	1	8	9
Lancashire and Cumbria	3	5	8	1	8	9
Merseyside and Cheshire	1	4	5	1	8	9
Total	7 44%	17 22%	24 25%	3 19%	24 30%	27 28%

Military Corrective Training Centre

MCTC	1	3	4	0	7	7
Total	1 100%	3 14%	4 18%	0 0%	7 33%	7 32%

Appendix five

Recommendations followed up at independent reviews of progress and judgements made (1 April 2022 to 31 March 2023)

Judgements (HMI Prisons recommendations)									
In order of visit:	Number of recommendations reviewed at IRP	No meaningful progress		Insufficient progress		Reasonable progress		Good progress	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
		Swinfen Hall	10	0	0%	6	60%	2	20%
Deerbolt	11	3	27%	1	9%	4	36%	3	27%
Hull	9	0	0%	4	44%	3	33%	2	22%
Belmarsh	10	2	20%	0	0%	7	70%	1	10%
Cookham Wood	10	1	10%	5	50%	3	30%	1	10%
Erlestoke	13	0	0%	2	15%	7	54%	4	31%
Woodhill	8	0	0%	4	50%	4	50%	0	0%
Wandsworth	9	2	22%	3	33%	2	22%	2	22%

Judgements (HMI Prisons recommendations)									
In order of visit:	Number of recommendations reviewed at IRP	No meaningful progress		Insufficient progress		Reasonable progress		Good progress	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
		Wetherby	11	1	9%	6	55%	3	27%
Foston Hall	12	2	17%	3	25%	4	33%	3	25%
Swaleside	13	3	23%	4	31%	4	31%	2	15%
Chelmsford	8	0	0%	3	38%	2	25%	3	38%
Werrington	9	3	33%	3	33%	2	22%	1	11%
Rochester	8	1	13%	6	75%	1	13%	0	0%
Feltham A	5	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%
Brixton	14	2	14%	4	29%	3	21%	5	36%

Judgements (HMI Prisons recommendations)									
In order of visit:	Number of recommendations reviewed at IRP	No meaningful progress		Insufficient progress		Reasonable progress		Good progress	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Winchester	8	1	13%	1	13%	6	75%	0	0%
Ranby	8	1	13%	3	38%	1	13%	3	38%
Forest Bank	8	1	13%	2	25%	4	50%	1	13%
Parc YOI	4	0	0%	1	25%	2	50%	1	25%
The Mount	9	2	22%	4	44%	3	33%	0	0%
Total	197	25	13%	66	34%	70	36%	36	18%

Judgements (Ofsted themes)							
In order of visit:	Number of Ofsted themes reviewed at IRP	Insufficient progress		Reasonable progress		Significant progress	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
		Swinfen Hall	4	2	50%	2	50%
Deerbolt	3	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Hull	3	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%
Belmarsh	3	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%
Cookham Wood	4	1	25%	3	75%	0	0%
Erlestoke	3	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%
Woodhill	3	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%
Wandsworth	3	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%
Wetherby	3	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%

Judgements (Ofsted themes)							
In order of visit:	Number of Ofsted themes reviewed at IRP	Insufficient progress		Reasonable progress		Significant progress	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
		Foston Hall	3	2	67%	1	33%
Swaleside	4	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Chelmsford	3	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%
Werrington	3	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%
Rochester	3	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%
Feltham A	4	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%
Brixton	4	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%
Winchester	4	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%
Ranby	4	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%

Judgements (Ofsted themes)							
In order of visit:	Number of Ofsted themes reviewed at IRP	Insufficient progress		Reasonable progress		Significant progress	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
Forest Bank	4	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Parc YOI	0	–	–	–	–	–	–
The Mount	3	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	68	37	54%	30	44%	1	1%

Appendix six

Further resources

Analysis of prisoner survey responses for adult men's and women's prisons is available on our website:

www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons

Glossary

ACCT

Assessment, care in custody and teamwork (case management for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm).

ACDT

Assessment, care in detention and teamwork (case management for immigration detainees at risk of suicide or self-harm).

Adult at risk

Under the Care Act 2014, safeguarding duties apply to an adult who: has needs for care and support (whether or not the local authority is meeting any of those needs); and is experiencing, or is at risk of, abuse or neglect; and as a result of those care and support needs is unable to protect themselves from either the risk of, or the experience of, abuse and neglect.

Bail information officer

Bail information officers gather information and provide it to the Crown Prosecution Service to aid them in their remand request to the court. The scheme is aimed at reducing unnecessary demands in custody.

Care Quality Commission (CQC)

CQC is the independent regulator of health and adult social care in England. It monitors, inspects and regulates services to make sure they meet fundamental standards of quality and safety. For information on CQC's standards of care and the action it takes to improve services, visit: www.cqc.org.uk

Category A

Prisoners on the highest category of security risk whose escape would be highly dangerous.

Category B

Prisoners for whom the highest conditions of security are not necessary but for whom escape must be made very difficult.

Category C

Prisoners who cannot be trusted in open conditions who do not have the will or resources to make a determined escape attempt.

Category D

Prisoners who can be reasonably trusted to serve their sentence in open conditions.

Challenge, support and intervention plan (CSIP)

HMPPS system used by all adult prisons to manage prisoners who are violent or pose a heightened risk of being violent. These prisoners are managed and supported on a plan with individualised targets and regular reviews. Not everyone who is violent is case managed on CSIP. Some prisons also use the CSIP framework to support victims of violence.

Clean and decent project

HMPPS project to support the standard of cleanliness and physical decency that is expected in all prisons as part of a respectful, humane and rehabilitative culture.

HMCTS

His Majesty's Courts and Tribunals Service.

HMICFRS

His Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services.

HMPPS

His Majesty's Prison and Probation Service.

IEP

Incentives and earned privileges.

IRC

Immigration removal centre.

Key workers

Introduced under OMiC (see below), prison officer key workers aim to have regular contact with named prisoners.

Leader

Anyone with leadership or management responsibility.

Listeners

Prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners.

MAPPA

Multi-agency public protection arrangements.

NPM

National Preventive Mechanism.

OASys

Offender assessment system. A framework used by both prisons and probation for assessing the likelihood of reoffending and the risk of harm to others.

Ofsted

Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills.

OMiC

The offender management in custody model was introduced in 2017. In the first stage, prison officer key workers were introduced with the aim of having regular contact with named prisoners. The second phase, from 2019, has seen the introduction of core offender management and prison offender managers (POMs).

OPCAT

Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

PECS

Prisoner Escort and Custody Services.

POM

Prison offender manager; introduced under OMiC.

PPO

Prisons and Probation Ombudsman.

Protected characteristics

The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

Reconnect

An NHS England pilot programme to improve health outcomes for vulnerable prisoners through access to all the health services they need after release and an effective transfer to community services.

Remand prisoners

Prisoners who have not yet been tried and are therefore unconvicted. If there are no security concerns, a remand prisoner will have a number of special rights and privileges, including receiving additional letters and visits, not having to share a cell with a convicted prisoner and not working unless they choose to. Remand prisoners are normally held in local category B prisons.

ROTL

Release on temporary licence.

Secure video calls

A system commissioned by HMPPS that requires users to download an app to their phone or computer. Before a visit can be booked, users must upload valid ID.

Special accommodation

A dedicated cell or improvised normal accommodation where furniture, bedding and/or sanitation has been removed in the interests of safety.

STC

Secure training centre.

STHF

Short-term holding facility.

Storybook Dads

A scheme enabling prisoners to record a story for their children.

Time out of cell

Time out of cell, in addition to formal ‘purposeful activity’, includes any time prisoners are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

Urgent Notification

Where an inspection identifies significant concerns about the treatment and conditions of detainees, the Chief Inspector may issue an Urgent Notification to the Secretary of State within seven calendar days stating the reasons for concerns and identifying issues that require improvement. The Secretary of State commits to respond publicly to the concerns raised within 28 calendar days.

YOI

Young offender institution.

Website references

HM Inspectorate of Prisons reports, Expectations and inspection/scrutiny visit methodology can be found at:
www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons

HM Prison and Probation Service Safety in custody statistics can be found at:
www.gov.uk/government/collections/safety-in-custody-statistics

Information on the National Preventive Mechanism can be found at:
www.nationalpreventivemechanism.org.uk

ISBN: 978-1-5286-4266-8
E02934995 07/23